Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/masterideaofsain0000rudo

THE MASTER-IDEA OF SAINT PAUL'S EPISTLES OR THE REDEMPTION.

UNIVERSITAS CATHOLICA LOVANIENSIS
Dissertationes
Ad gradum magistri in Facultate Theologica
consequendum conscriptae
SERIES II, TOMUS 13.

The Master-Idea of Saint Paul's Epistles

OR THE

Redemption

A STUDY OF BIBLICAL THEOLOGY

BY

RUDOLPH G. BANDAS
DOCTOR AND MAGISTER OF SACRED THEOLOGY
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF LOUVAIN.

Property of
COSA
Please return to
Graduate Theological
Union Library

BRUGES
DESCLÉE, DE BROUWER AND Cº
1925.
(Printed in Belgium).

ILLUSTRISSIMO · REVERENDISSIMO DOMINO
DOMINO

AUGUSTINO DOWLING

ARCHIEPISCOPO SANCTI PAULI (STAT. FED. AM.)
DIVINARUM · HUMANARUMQUE · SCIENTIARUM
FAUTORI · ILLUSTRI
GREGIS · PASTORI · VIGILANTISSIMO
CLERI · POPULIQUE · PATRI · AMANTISSIMO
IN PERENNE · GRATI ANIMI
AC · FILIALIS · AMORIS · TESTIMONIUM.

A. 2819

ILLUSTRISSIMO · DOCTISSIMO · DOMINO

PAULINO LADEUZE

PROT · APOST. · AD · INSTAR · PARTICIP.
CANONICO · HONORARIO · ECCL. · CATH. · TORNAC.
DOCTORI ET MAGISTRO · SACR. · THEOL.
COMMENDATORI · ORDINIS · LEOPOLDINI
DECURIONI · LEG. · HON.
CLARISS. · PRAEF. · ORNAM. · IN · ORD. · COR. · ITAL.
COMMEND. · PHAL. · ORD. · ISAB. · CATH.
SODALI ACAD. · REG. · BELG. ET · SOD. · ADI. ·
ACAD. · INSCRIPT. · ET · LITT. · PARIS.
SODALI · HON. · CAUSA · ACAD. · REG. · ARCHAEOL. ·
BELG. · ET · ACAD. · LITT. · ET · SCIENT. · NEAP.
RECTORI MAGNIFICO UNIVERSITATIS CATHOLICAE

ET

VIRO · EXIMIO · DOCTISSIMO

EDUARDO TOBAC

CANONICO · HONORARIO · ECCL. · METROP. · MECHL.
DOCTORI · ET · MAGISTRO · SACR. · THEOL.
EQUITI · ORDINIS · LEOPOLDINI
SACRAE · SCRIPT. · ANTECESSORI · PERITISSIMO
SUORUM · STUDIORUM · MODERATORI
HANC · SUAM · LUCUBRATIONEM DEVOTISSIMO · ANIMO
D. D. D.

AUCTOR.

PREFACE

What, it may be asked, is the master-idea of Saint Paul's Epistles ? Is his doctrine theocentric, anthropocentric, or Christocentric ? The idea of God, though it occupies a prominent place in the teaching of the Apostle, is not characteristic of him, nor does it distinguish him from his companions and compatriots. His conception of man, of man's slavery to sin and inability to fulfill God's law without the aid of grace, is developed only in Rom. c. VII, so that if this passage had not been written we would have no means of recovering the key to Saint Paul's doctrine. One need not read very far in the Pauline Epistles without being soon convinced that the Apostle's thoughts center around Jesus Christ. Were Christ removed from the pages of his letters, his doctrine would become absolutely unintelligible.

In fact, the manner in which the converted Pharisee, who hitherto had been so proud of his dignity and so scornful of the idols of flesh and blood, speaks of Jesus of Nazareth is a phenomenon which seems to contradict all the laws of psychology and all the analogies of history. He now recognizes as Lord and Master Him Whose name he heretofore wished to obliterate and Whose work he strove to annihilate. He will not suffer that the Son of God be compared with any created being. Christ is the sole victor of sin, the sole redeemer of the human race, the sole mediator of grace ; He eclipses all by His splendor, fills all with His plenitude, exists before all the ages (Rom. III, 23-25 ; Eph. I, 21-23 ; Col. I, 18-20 ; I Tim. II, 5). To Him every power must be subject, and before Him every knee must bow (Phil. II, 9-11). He is the image of the invisible God (Col. I, 15), the brightness of His glory (Heb. I, 3). By Him everything was made, by Him everything subsists, and to Him everything converges (I Cor. VIII, 6 ; Heb. I, 10 ; Col. I, 16, 17). He was yesterday, He is today, and the same for all the ages (Heb. XIII, 8). He is the end of the Law (Rom. X, 4), the corner-stone and foundation without which no building can stand (I Cor. III, 11 ; Eph. II, 20). He is our peace and

reconciliation (Eph. II, 14), our redemption and sanctification (I Cor. I, 30), our resurrection and glory (Rom. IV, 25). Instinctively one speaks of the object of his affections, and who ever loved Christ more than His " bondslave ", His convert of the Damascan road : " If any man love not our Lord Jesus Christ let him be anathema " (I Cor. XVI, 22). Hence if we open at random any one of his Epistles, we infallibly find some reference to the nature or work of the God-Man. The name " Christ " appears 203 times in his writings, " Christ Jesus " 92 times, " Jesus Christ " 84 times, " Lord " 157 times, " Lord Jesus " 24 times, " the Lord Jesus Christ " 64 times, and " Jesus " 16 times. Besides these, many other titles are to be found such as " Saviour ", " Son of God ", as well as incidental phrases where Christ is not mentioned directly by name.

Saint Paul considers the Person of Christ, however, less in its intimate being than under the aspects whereby it enters into the divine plan of salvation. The Pauline Christology is conceived and formulated from a soteriological view-point. It is Jesus Christ in His role as Redeemer of the world Who is the object of the Apostle's love. Anything that does not refer to " Jesus " as " Saviour " and to " Christ " as " Messias " does not enter within the Apostle's scope. Among his converts he proposed to know nothing save Christ and Him Crucified (I Cor. II, 2). Though he was well acquainted with the historical facts of Christ's life, he did not assume the task of instructing the new converts concerning these, but left this office to the catechists. And if perchance he happened to instruct the neophytes about the rudiments of Christianity, he did not forget to place the mystery of the Cross at the basis of his teaching. Before the eyes of the Galatians he painted the image of Christ Crucified so vividly and conspicuously that he cannot understand how they were so easily bewitched by another (Gal. III, 1). If to the Corinthians he recalls the substance of his gospel, the Cross and the Resurrection, which is a necessary complement of the redeeming death, again receive primary consideration (I Cor. XV, 3-4). The ἐπιγνώσις and wisdom, therefore, at which the Apostle aims, when his converts are capable of understanding it, has for its object Christ Crucified, " unto the Jews indeed a stumbling block, and unto the Gentiles foolishness, but unto them that are called, the power and wisdom of God " (I Cor. I, 23, 24).

Saint Paul's conception of Christ's redeeming mission to sinful humanity was already contained, in germ at least, in the words which the Risen Lord addressed to him on the Damascan road : " I am Jesus whom thou persecutest " (Acts IX, 5). Saul saw that by persecuting the Christians he was in some way persecuting Christ Himself, and that there was consequently a sort of mystic identity between Jesus and His disciples. And later on when he meditated, under divine inspiration and illumination, on those solemn and momentous words, he came to a fuller comprehension of the " mystery of God ". This " mystery of God " or, as he sometimes also calls it, " mystery of Christ ", which constituted the distinctive feature of his " gospel ", is nothing else but the redemption and reconciliation of all men in and by Christ. It is a plan of salvation, which was conceived by God from all eternity, which was hidden in the penumbra of the old revelation and merely insinuated by the prophets, but which is now solemnly proclaimed to the whole universe. It is a plan whereby Christ is to be a universal Saviour and a common hope, not only of the Jews but also of the Gentiles. This was in Saint Paul's eyes " the mystery which had been hidden from ages and generations, but now is manifested to his saints " (Col. I, 26). This according to the Ephesians was the " mystery which in other generations was not known to the sons of men, as it is now revealed to his holy apostles and prophets in the Spirit, that the Gentiles should be fellow-heirs and of the same body, and co-partners of his promise in Christ Jesus, by the gospel " (Eph. I, 1-13). It is the breaking down of the middle wall of partition, the nailing forever to the Cross of the menacing bond, which caused Saint Paul to rejoice with great joy. This was the supreme truth of that " gospel " which Saint Paul received " not of man, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ " (Gal. I, 12), and which was characterized by this special feature that it proclaimed salvation for the Gentiles apart from any necessity of submitting to the Law of Moses.

But whence, according to the Apostle, flow all these blessings of the new economy ? From Calvary. It is there that the " handwriting of the decree that was against us " (Col. II, 14) was blotted out. It is there that Christ broke down the " middle-wall of partition ", and " reconciled both to God in one body by the cross " (Eph. II, 16). It is there that the Gentiles, who formerly were " foreigners " and " strangers " to the common-

wealth of Israel, were made " fellow-citizens with the saints, and the domestics of God " (Eph. II, 19, 12). It is there, in brief, that Christ was incorporated into humanity and humanity into Christ.

Standing at the foot of the Cross on Calvary's summit, the Apostle looks out, as from an observatory, upon humanity which hitherto had been " without Christ ". His eyes rest, first of all, on that section of mankind which had been a " stranger to the testament, and had no hope of the promise " (Eph. II, 12). Though the Gentiles knew God, yet, by denying Him due glory and gratitude, they suffered themselves to plunge into the penal darkness of ignorant speculation and the folly of vaunted wisdom. They sank to such depths of spiritual imbecility that they ended even in the idolatry of reptiles. Because they guiltily abandoned God, God abandoned them to their own guiltiness ; because they despised Him, He allowed them to make themselves utterly contemptible. The " passions of dishonor " to which He abandoned them rotted their heart with retributive corruption. Pagan society thus became one foul disease of unnatural depravity. In fact, he who would know what the aspect of paganism was to him who had seen it in its characteristic developments from childhood, need read only that most terrible passage of all Scripture (Rom. I, 18-32) where under the glare of holy wrath we see paganism in all its polluting and hideous disintegration. Far other might have been its aspect if the glamour of Hellenic grace were flung over it, but the Apostle, endowed by inward chastity with a diviner *moly* and a more potent *haemony* than those of Homer's or Milton's song, reveals it to us fearlessly in all its insolent and revolting degradation.

And when he turns to the self-satisfied Jew, the full-blown religionist in all his assumed infallibility and air of " Stand aside, for I am holier than thou ", Saint Paul bursts out in the same terrible denunciations of undeniable sins (Rom. c. II). In fact, we often catch a glimpse in his writings of those moral struggles and inward battles through which he himself must have passed during the long period in which " he lived as a Pharisee ", before he came to believe that on Calvary " God proposed Jesus Christ to be a propitiation through faith in his blood " (Rom. III, 25), and that " there was no condemnation to them that were in Christ Jesus " (Rom. VIII, I). From his own

statements we know that if external conformity were all, then Saul, touching the righteousness of the Law, was blameless, having lived in all good conscience towards God. Had he put the question to the Great Master, " what must I do to be saved? " or been bidden to " keep the commandments ", he would certainly have replied with the youthful ruler, " all these have I kept from my youth ", and — he might have added — " very much besides ". And yet we trace in his Epistles how bitterly he felt the hollowness of this outward obedience, how awful and burdensome had been to him " the curse of the Law. " Under the dignified exterior of the Pharisee lay a wildly-beating heart, under the broad phylactery an anxious brain throbbed with terrible questionings. He yearned for a righteousness, could he but know of it, which would abound more than that of the Scribes and Pharisees,which would give him a clean heart and put a right spirit within him. But in all this struggle to attain righteousness there seemed to be no satisfaction, no hope, nothing but a possibly mitigated and yet inevitable curse. And even when many years of weariness and wandering were over, when he had already wrung from the hard experiences of life the lesson that by the works of the Law no man can be justified in God's sight, we still catch in his epistle the mournful echoes of those days of stress and storm, echoes as of the thunder when its fury is over and it is only sobbing far away among the distant hills. We hear them when, in accents of deep self-pity, he tells us of his bondage to the tyrannical power of Sin, and of the struggle between the flesh and the spirit, between the law of sin in his members and the law of God, which, though holy and just and good and ordained unto life, he found to be unto death (Rom. c. VII).

These pre-Christian scenes which so frequently attracted the Apostle were for him a mere preparation for the Redeemer, a mere prelude to Calvary. They were for him the prehistory, as it where, of Christ meditating in God's bosom His merciful designs, a prehistory of the Church divinely prepared by her Spouse. For though God hates sin and detests the sinner, He loves the creature of His handiwork, and " commendeth his charity towards us because when as yet we were sinners " (Rom. V, 8) He sent His only-begotten Son into the world. Jesus Christ espoused the cause of sinful humanity, and, by being " made under the law " (Gal. IV, 4) a " malediction "

(Gal. III, 13) and " sin " (II Cor. v, 21) for us, became *solidaire* with the human family (Rom. VIII, 3). He wished to be intimately united with mankind in order that He, as Chief of the human race, might give His Life a λύτρον for those who were in bondage, that by His Death on the Cross He might offer up Himself " an oblation and a sacrifice to God for an odour of sweetness " (Eph. v, 2), and that by the shedding of His Blood He might satisfy divine justice.

Hence, after having surveyed that world which had been " without Christ ", the Apostle rests his eyes upon the Cross, the instrument of the Divine Envoy's actual incorporation into the human family. By His obedience, an obedience which consisted in the free acceptance of death on the Cross, Jesus Christ became the Second Adam, the Head of the new redeemed humanity. Because Christ " humbled himself, becoming obedient unto death even to the death of the cross, God exalted him, and hath given him a name which is above all names " (Phil. II, 8, 9). On Calvary was verified the antithesis between the first Adam, " by whose disobedience many were made sinners ", and the new Adam, " by whose obedience many shall be made just " (Rom. v, 19). There all humanity was concentrated in the will of Christ, as in the terrestrial Paradise it was concentrated in the will of our first parent. There, too, Christ is our paschal lamb (I Cor. v, 8), our expiatory and propitiatory sacrifice for sin (Rom. III, 25, VIII, 2), the immolation which seals the alliance (Heb. IX, 15-23). At the breath of the *consummatum est* the " middle-wall of partition " crumbled into ruin, and thetwo great sections of humanity, which hitherto had been at enmity, are henceforth welded into one (Col. I, 20 ; Eph. II, 14, 16).

On Calvary, also, was effected in turn humanity's incorporation into Christ. For this reciprocal incorporation three elements are required : grace, faith, and baptism. In the actual economy, however, all grace flows to us from the Redeemer's Cross (Rom. III, 24-26). Thence, too, comes the free gift of faith, the primary object of which is frequently the Crucified and Risen Saviour. And baptism, what is it but an efficacious and sacramental representation of Christ's Death and Resurrection. In baptism we really die to sin by being grafted on to the dying Christ, and, by rising with Him from the baptismal waters, we begin to lead a new life of grace. No one can be a Christian without baptism, and there can be no baptism

without Christ's Death and its essential complement, the Resurrection.

Occasionally the Apostle lifts his eyes from Calvary towards the future in order to contemplate there the accomplishment of God's designs and the consummation of the ages. He can see there Christ's Spouse, the Church, gradually attaining its full stature and maturity, and reaching its complete configuration as determined by divine predestination. But the future interests him only in so far as it is a corollary of the Passion and a fruit of the Cross. The habitual subject of Saint Paul's meditation is the Saviour's work of restoration on Calvary. For it is there that Christ strikes a mortal blow at Sin, the flesh, and death ; there that He assumes by right of conquest the headship of regenerate humanity ; there that He becomes Master of the spirit-powers who henceforth are powerless to overcome man by their insidious onslaughts (Eph. VI, 10-12) ; there that He assumes preeminence over the angels (Eph. I, 20-21) ; there that He, as " the first-born of the living and the dead ", becomes Head of the Church (Eph. I, 22-23 ; Col. I, 18 ; Rom. XIV, 8-9, VIII, 29). It is on Calvary that Christ reconciles all, pacifies all, unifies all.

The Apostle thus sees Christ descending upon earth in order to assume a primacy over all things. He sees the new Adam appropriating us unto Himself and incorporating us into His mystic body. All humanity, the prolongation and complement, as it were, of Christ, is thus drawn up with Him even into the presence of the Blessed Trinity, and " made to sit together in the heavenly places " (Eph. II, 6). Well could the Apostle, when he contemplated these secret designs of Providence, exclaim : " O the depth of the riches of the wisdom and of the knowledge of God ! How incomprehensible are his judgments, and how unsearchable his ways ! For who hath known the mind of the Lord? Or who hath been his counsellor ? Or who hath first given to him, and recompense shall be made him ? For of him, and by him, and in him, are all things : to him be glory forever " (Rom. XI, 33-36).

***

In the course of this study we shall use indifferently the terms " Redemption " and " Atonement " to denote the whole,

objective, redeeming, work of Christ. We shall employ the former because of its traditional usage in the Church, the latter because of its widespread popularity in English theology. We are not unaware that the word " Atonement ", of which " reconciliation " is considered as the historical equivalent (Rom. v, 11), is acquiring among many Protestant theologians an ever more restricted and even anti-Christian meaning. In our usage of the term, however, we shall abstract from all its modern acceptations.

Since our dissertation is primarily one of Biblical theology it is not within its scope to adduce either the Patristic evidence concerning Christ's redeeming Death or the speculative developments of the dogma. For the former the reader is referred to Pesch's, *Das Sühneleiden unseres göttlichen Erlösers* [1], Hugon's *Le Mystère de la Rédemption* [2] and *De Verbo Incarnato et Hominum Redemptore* [3], Rivière's, *Le dogme de la Rédemption* [4], and Tixeront's, *Histoire des dogmes* [5], works, in which the testimonies of the Fathers are studied at considerable length. For a scholastic treatment of the dogma of the Redemption we refer the reader to Cardinal Billot's, *De Verbo Incarnato* [6].

As sources of Saint Paul's theology we shall use the fourteen Epistles received under his name. The objections raised against the authenticity of some of these are far from being convincing, and among the explanations proposed for their origin the traditional thesis is still the most satisfactory even in the eyes of the critics.

In order to avoid needless repetition and too lengthy bibliographies in the foot-notes we have adopted a system of abbreviations in quoting theological reviews, periodicals, and dictionaries. These abbreviations are fully explained at the head of our general bibliography.

Throughout our thesis we shall have frequent occasion to refer to the works of different authors. Simple references to the writings of others do not imply an approval of the matter contained in the pages quoted, but are intended merely as an aid to the reader who might wish to pursue further a particular

1. p. 49 ff.
2. pp. 49 ff., 69 ff., 120 ff., 159 ff., 196 ff.
3. pp. 385-408.
4. *Essai d'étude historique; Étude théologique*, p. 267 ff.
5. Cf. Index in each of the three volumes under *soteriologie*.
6. p. 453 ff.

point touched perhaps only incidentally in our study. Quotations from Catholic authors without further comment are adduced in order to render more complete the exposition of the particular point which we happen to be considering. Occasionally we shall quote from those Protestant authors whose theories we shall study, and that for a twofold reason : first, that our criticism and refutation may not seem unjust, and, secondly, because, frequently, to state an opinion is to refute it, for such is the vagueness, and so fantastic are some of the hypotheses proposed by modern authors. At times we shall quote also from those Protestant authors whose opinion happens to be the same as ours. This is done not so much to confirm our doctrine as to show that the modern rationalistic and often anti-Christian theories, paraded under the name of the " New Theology ", have not the unanimous approval of all Protestant theologians. Many of these, on the contrary, are still willing to admit that the traditional Catholic interpretation is the only one which corresponds to the reality of facts.

The problem of the Redemption has always been a vital issue for the human mind. We need but glance over the history of dogma and we shall readily see what a prominent place is always accorded this doctrine. Among English Protestants there is perhaps no other doctrine which has been the subject of so frequent and lively discussions as that of the Atonement. That modern theologians should be so preoccupied with this dogma need not surprise us. For with the disintegration of religion they naturally seek a theory of salvation which will be in harmony with that minimum to which they still cling. Protestantism, the religion of " spiritual experience ", will have no dogmas, and if Saint Paul is dogmatic some means must be found to show that he did not mean (or at least was not responsible for) what he said.

Hence Protestant theologians have recourse to a distinction which would certainly seem strange to Saint Paul and cause him no small shock, should he accidentally drop in to some of our modern *Kerr* or *Bampton Lectures*. They make a distinction between what they call the " religion " and " theology " of Paul. The former, Saint Paul is said to draw from the pure fountains of the Master, the latter, which constitutes the greater part of his teaching, is said to be an inheritance of his Pharisaical and Hellenistic training, and, as such, wholly un-

acceptable to the " modern " mind. The writings of the Apostle, we are told, are simply a patchwork of odds and ends from the opinions of others. No man excels others beyond certain arbitrarily fixed limits, and if Saint Paul's actual achievement is not explicable by what others have thought or done before him, much that history ascribes to him must be denied as his. Heredity and environment, according to the verdict of these modern scholars, count for more than individuality. Hence they represent Saint Paul's Christianity as a syncretism pure and simple, composed of elements borrowed from every conceivable source, and moulded into a superficial unity and system by the forceful personality of the Apostle. Of any relation to Christ, the Founder, of any inheritance from the primitive Apostolic Church, of any product of his own experience and reflection there is hardly a trace left.

These unfounded and often contradictory theories could not fail to produce a vigorous protest even among Protestant theologians. Hence, thereafter only one of two alternatives remained : either to accept the testimony of Saint Paul at its true worth, or reject and overthrow it completely. It is the latter course which many Protestant theologians have chosen, a result, to which the dissolving action of the so-called " Biblical criticism " has contributed its share. These theologians no longer seek to explain the Redemption in the light of revelation but maintain that its basis is to be found in the individual conscience alone. And here modern philosophy, with its anthropometric spirit and its substitution of that vague thing called " religious experience " in the place of the intellect, comes aptly to their aid. After having rejected all authority, even that of the intellect, Protestants have come to base their doctrines on the shifting grounds of religious experience. And the resulting theories are almost as numerous as the authors who proposed them. For if one man's feeling is different from that of another or from that which he himself had experienced yesterday, there is no reason why logically he should not have a correspondingly different theory. A view which is gaining much ground in our own time is that which places the essence of the Atonement in its ethical appeal, — a view, which, if consistent, puts the Redeemer outside of the Redemption and Christ outside of Christianity. And in proposing this theory its authors assure us that they are not only continuing the spirit

of Ritschl but also bringing to their logical issues the principles laid down by Luther. The logical consequence, then, of the principle of private judgment is destruction of the fundamental doctrines of Christianity.

The Catholic Church, although it does not claim that the Bible is the sole rule of faith, a principle, which Protestants originally defended, has always maintained its traditional respect for the Sacred Scriptures, and on them it has always based its teaching concerning the Redemption. In fact, to quote in a general way the words of an Oxford Professor, Shears, " we have the edifying spectacle of the Church of Rome jealously guarding the Scriptures which Protestants have corrupted " [1]. A doctrine of the Atonement which has no relation to the Scriptures, moves outside of the pale of Christianity, and can consequently have no value for us. The Pauline Epistles are admittedly rich and profound in the ideas which they attach to the redeeming Death. In truth, we are in constant danger of paying too much attention to only particular aspects or of overlooking points which may appear trivial to us but which for the Apostle were of the highest consideration. To study the Pauline doctrine in all its fulness and variety, and in its light to judge the meagre and denatured conceptions of modern thought, will be the aim and task of the present study.

We wish hereby to express our sincere gratitude to all those who in any way assisted us in the preparation of this work, especially to Mr. Francis Jenkinson, Librarian of the University of Cambridge, through whose kind aid we were introduced to the English literature on our subject; to the Very Rev. Rector and the Rev. Librarian of the Biblical Institute of Rome, who so willingly accorded us unrestricted use of the splendidly-equipped Scriptural library of this institution; and to the Rev. F. P. Lyons, C. S. P., S.T. D., of the American Church of St. Susanna in Rome and Professor of Theology, who so generously consented to revise our manuscript before printing. Finally, we wish to acknowledge our special obligations to our devoted and savant Professors of the Schola Major of Theology of the Louvain University, and, above all, to Rev. E. Tobac, S. T. D. et Mag., to whose inspiration we owe the inception of this study and to whose constant encouragement we owe its completion.

1. *The Gospel according to St. Paul*, p. 115.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

I. ABBREVIATIONS.

ACQR = *American Catholic Quarterly Review*, (610 S.Washington Square) Philadelphia.
AJT = *The American Journal of Theology*, (University of Chicago Press), Chicago.
Bess. = *Bessarione*, (Via Merulana, Palazzo Brancaccio), Rome.
Biblica = *Biblica*, (Piazza della Pilotta, 35), Rome.
BS = *Biblische Studien*, (Herder & C°), Freiburg im B.
BZ = *Biblische Zeitschrift*, (Herder & C°), Freiburg im B.
CE = *Catholic Encyclopedia*, (R. Appleton Co.), New York.
DApFC = *Dictionnaire apologétique de la foi catholique*, (G. Beauchesne), Paris.
DTC = *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique*, (Letouzey et Ané), Paris.
EBi = *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, (Adam & C. Black), London.
ERE = *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*, (C. Scribner's Sons), New York.
Études = *Études*, (5, Place du Président Mithouard), Paris.
Exp. = *Expositor*, (Hodder & Stoughton), London.
HDB = *Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible*, (C. Scribner's Sons), New York.
HJ = *Hibbert Journal*, (William & Norgate), London.
HJ (Suppl.) = *Hibbert Journal Supplement*, 1909.
HThR = *Harvard Theological Review*, (Harvard University Press), Cambridge.
IThQ = *The Irish Theological Quarterly*, (The Kenny Press), Dublin.
JBL = *Journal of Biblical Literature*, (Yale University Press), New Haven.
JR = *The Journal of Religion*, (University of Chicago Press), Chicago.
JTS = *The Journal of Theological Studies*, (H. Milford, Amen Corner E. C.), London.
MGWJ = *Monatschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums, (Koebner'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung)*, Breslau.
Month = *The Month*, (Longmans, Green & Co)., London.
NKZ = *Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift*, (A. Deichertsche Verlagsbuchhdlg), Leipzig.
NTA = *Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen*, (Aschendorffschen Verlagsbuchhdlg), Münster, i. W.
PRE = *Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche*, (J. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung), Leipzig.
RAp. = *Revue apologétique* (J. Beauchesne), Paris.
RAug. = *Revue Augustinienne*, (5, Rue Bayard), Paris.
RB = *Revue biblique*, (J. Gabalda), Paris.
RCF = *Revue du clergé français* (Letonzey et Ané), Paris.
RHE = *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique*, (40, Rue Namur), Louvain.

RechSR = *Recherches de science religieuse*, (5, Place du Président Mithouard), Paris.
RSPhTh = *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques*, (J. Gabalda), Paris.
RSR = *Revue des sciences religieuses*, (9bis, rue des Frères), Strasbourg,
RT = *Revue Thomiste*, (14, Rue des Arts), Toulouse.
SDB = *Standard Dictionary of the Bible*, (Charles Scribner's Sons), New York.
ThSK = *Theologische Studien und Kritiken*, (Verlag: F. A. Perthes), Gotha.
VDB = *Vigouroux's Dictionnaire de la Bible*, (Letonzey et Ané), Paris.
VDni = *Verbum Domini*, (Piazza della Pilotta, 35), Rome.
ZKT = *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie*, (Verlag: F. Rauch), Innsbruck.
ZNTW = *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, (Verlag: A. Töpelmann), Giessen.
ZWT = *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie*, (M. Diesterweg), Frankfurt am Main.

II. ARTICLES IN PERIODICALS AND DICTIONARIES.

AHERNE, C. *Galatians*, CE, vol. VI, pp. 336-340.
BANDAS, R. G. *St. Paul and Hellenism*, ACQR, 1920, pp. 255-273.
St. Paul and Christianity, ACQR, 1920, pp. 565-593.
BARTMANN, B. *S. Paulus und S. Jacobus über die Rechtfertigung*, BS, 1897, pp. 1-163.
BECKER, J. B. *Zur Frage des Schuldcharacters der Erbsünde*, ZKT, 1924, pp. 59-92.
BENZ, K. *Die Ethik des Apostels Paulus*, BS, 1912, pp. 1-184.
BERNARD, E. R. *Sin*, HDB, vol. IV, pp. 528-536.
BERNARD, J. H. *Fall*, HDB, vol. I, pp. 839-845.
BITTREMIEUX, J. *La distinction entre la justice originelle et la grâce sanctifiante d'après saint Thomas d'Aquin*,, RT, 1921, pp. 121-150.
BUCKHAM, J. W. *Are Christ and the Spirit Identical in Paul's Teaching*? Exp. 1921, pp. 154-160.
CAMPBELL, R. J. *Jesus or Christ*, HJ (Suppl.) 1909, pp. 180-192.
CATHALA, M. R. *La vie de l'église*, KT, 1912, pp. 743-762; 1913, pp. 1-16, 137-158, 655-677.
CHADWICK, G. A. *The Just Shall Live by Faith*, Exp., 1906, pp. 178-182.
D'ALÈS, A. *Le dogme catholique de la rédemption*, Études, 1913, pp. 170-197.
La doctrine de la récapitulation en saint Irénée, Rech SR, 1916, pp. 185-211.
Le sens de la rédemption, RAp, 1921, pp. 163-174.
Rédemption, DApFC, fasc. XX, pp. 541-582.
DAVIES, J. L. *The "Righteousness of God" in St. Paul*, JTS, 1900-1901, vol. II, pp. 198-206.
DEISSMANN, A. ἱλαστήριος *und* ἱλαστήριον, ZNTW, 1903, pp. 193-212.
Elements, EBi., vol. II, pp. 1258-1262.
DENNEY, J. *Fall (Biblical)*, ERE, vol. V, pp. 701-705.

DENNEY, J. *The Theology of the Epistle to the Romans*:
The Doctrine of Sin, Exp. 1901, pp. 172-181, 283-295.
Faith and the Righteousness of God, Exp., 1901, pp. 81-95.
The Righteousness of God and the New Life, Exp., 1901, pp. 299-311.
The Gospel a Divine Righteousness, Exp. 1901, pp. 433-450.

DRISCOLL, J. F. *Promise*, CE, vol. XII, pp. 453-454.

DRIVER, S. R. *Propitiation*, HDB, vol. IV, pp. 128-132.

DRUMMOND, J. *On the Meaning of "Righteousness of God", in the Theology of St. Paul*, HJ, 1902, pp. 83-95, 1903, pp. 272-293.

DUBOIS, F. *A propos du péché d'Adam*, RCF, 1909, pp. 424-426.

DURAND, A. *Le Christ 'premier né'*, RechSR, 1910, pp. 56-66.
La divinité de J.-C. dans s. Paul, Rom. IX, 5, RB, 1903, pp. 550-570.

FAILLON, M. *Dissertation sur le mystère de la rédemption des hommes par N. S. J.-C.*, RCF, 1915, pp. 426-446.

FRUTSAERT, E. *La 'justice de Dieu' dans saint Paul*, RechSR, 1911, pp. 167-182.

GOULD, E. P. *St. Paul's Use of* δικαιοῦν, AJT, 1897, pp. 149-158.

GRANDMAISON DE, L. *Un essai de Christologie moderne*, RechSR, 1911, 190-208.
Jesus Christ, DApFC, fasc XI, 1288-1538.

GRIMAL, L. *Une opinion théologique sur la rédemption*, RCF, 1912, pp. 100-102.

HAEUSER, P. *Der Gottessohn "geworden unter dem Gesetze"* (Gal. IV, 4), BZ, 1913, pp. 178-184.

HARENT, S. *Foi*, DTC, vol. VI, pp. 58-78.
Original Sin, CE, Vol. XI, pp. 312-315.

HILGENFELD, A. *Der Brief des Paulus an die Römer*, ZWT, 1900, pp. 385-407.

HUGUENY, ÉT. *Adam et le péché originel*, RT, 1911, pp. 64-88.
La rédemption, RSPhTh, 1911, pp. 297-320.

JONES, M. *St. Paul and the Angels*, Exp., 1918, pp. 356-370, 412-425.

KIRN, O. *Sünde*, PRE, vol. XIX, pp. 132-148.

LABOURT, J. *Notes d'exégèse sur Philipp.* II, 5-11, RB, 1898, pp. 402-415, 553-563.

LAGRANGE, M. J. *La justification d'après saint Paul*, RB, 1914, pp. 321-343, 494-503.

LATTEY, C. *Theses Paulinae*:
De divinitate Christi, VDni, 1923, pp. 198-206.
De existentia Dei cognita, VDni, 1923, pp. 311-314.
De justificatione per fidem, VDni, 1924, pp. 80-86.
De justitia impertita, VDni, 1924, pp. 149-153.

LE BACHELET, X. *Péché originel*, DAp FC, fasc. XVII, pp. 1735-1755.

LESETRE, H. *Circoncision*, VDB, vol. II, pp. 772-780.

LÖWY, Dr. M. *Die paulinische Lehre vom Gesetz*, MGWJ, 1903, pp. 322-339, 417-433, 534-544; 1904, pp. 268-276, 321-327, 400-416.

MACHOLZ, W. *Zum Verständnis des paulinischen Rechtfertigungsgedankens*, ThSK, 1915, pp. 29-61.

MACKINTOSH, R. *The Roots of St. Paul's Doctrine of Sin*, Exp., 1913, pp. 441-458.

MASSIE, J. *Elements*, HDB, vol. I, pp. 682-683.

MATTHEWS, S. *The Functional Value of Doctrines of the Atonement*, JR, 1921, pp. 148-159.

MEDEBIELLE, P. A. *La vie donnée en rançon*, Biblica, 1923, pp. 3-40.

MENZIES A. & EDIE W. *Paul*, ERE, vol. IX, pp. 680-695.

MERK, A. *Justus ex Fide vivit*, VDni, 1923, pp. 193-198, 213-237, 257-264.

MEYER, A. *Der Glaube Jesu und der Glaube an Jesum*, NKZ, 1900, pp. 621-644.

MICHEL, A. *Jésus-Christ*, DTC, vol. VIII, col. 1108-1411.

MONSE F. *Johannes und Paulus*, NTA, 1915, pp. 1-213.

MORGAN, W. *Faith (Christian)*, ERE, vol. V, pp. 689-694.

MOULTON, J. H. *Characteristics of New Testament Greek*, Exp. 1904, pp. 461-472.

NEELSEN, F. *Hat der Herr Jesus Christus geglaubt ?* NKZ, 1894, pp. 668-676.

ORR, J. *The Resurrection of Jesus*, Exp., 1908, pp. 420-437.

POHLE, J. *Justification*, CE, vol. III, pp. 573-578.

PRAT, F. *Le triomphe du Christ sur les principautés et les puissances*, Rech SR, 1912, pp. 201-229.
L'idée-mère de la théologie de saint Paul, Études, 1900, pp. 203-223.

PROTIN, S. *Les éléments du monde (dans la pensée de saint Paul)* RAug., 1909, pp. 71-74.

RICHARD, L. *La rédemption, mystère d'amour*, RechSR, 1923, pp. 193-218, 397-418.

RIVIÈRE, J. *La rédemption devant la pensée moderne ; deux enquêtes dans l'église d'Angleterre*, RCF, 1912, pp. 161-180, 278-305.
Le premier théologien de la rédemption, — à propos de publications récentes, RCF, 1912, pp. 669-684 ; 1913, pp. 32-52.
La rédemption, RCF, 1913, pp. 115-120.
Le péché originel, RCF, 1914, pp. 471-473.
Où en est le problème de la rédemption, RSR, 1923, pp. 211-232.

ROPES, J. H. *" Righteousness " and " the Righteousness of God ", in the Old Testament and in St. Paul*, JBL, 1903, pp. 211-227.

SCHULZ, O. Τί οὖν ὁ νόμος; *Verhältnis von Gesetz, Sünde, und Evangelium*, ThSK, 1902, pp. 5-56.

SMITH, S. F. *The Atonement*, Month, 1919, pp. 241-249.
The Atonement Theologically Explained, Month, 1919, pp. 348-359.

SPACIL, T. *Christus caput corporis mystici ecclesiae*, Bess. 1920, pp. 147-176.

STEVENS, A. *The Forensic Meaning of* δικαιοσύνη, AJT, 1897, pp. 443-450.

THAYER, C. S. *Elements*, SDB, p. 206.

Thomas Griffith, W. H. *The Doctrine of the Church in the Epistle to the Ephesians*. Exp. 1906, pp. 318-339.

Tobac, E. *La* δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ *dans saint Paul*, RHE, 1908, pp. 1-18.

Toner, P. J. *The Soteriological Teaching of Christ*, IThQ, 1907, pp. 89-109.

Warfield, B. B. *Faith*, HDB, vol. I, pp. 827-838.

Watson, J. *The Holy Catholic Church*, Exp., 1900, pp. 347-366.

III. COMMENTARIES, BOOKS, LEXICONS, GRAMMARS, etc.

Abbott, T. K. *Epistles to the Ephesians and to the Colossians*, Edinburgh, 1895.

Andrews, H. T. *The Value of the Theology of St. Paul for Modern Thought*[2], London, 1915.

Babut, C. E. *Étude biblique sur la rédemption*, Nimes, 1914.

Bainvel, J. V. *Nature et surnaturel* [5], Paris, 1920.

Bayley, E. *St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians*, London, 1896.

Beet, J. *A Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans*, London, 1900.

Bertrand, E. *Une nouvelle conception de la Rédemption*, Paris, 1891.

Biard, J. *Les vertus théologales d'après les épîtres de saint Paul*, Paris, 1924.

Billot, L. *De personali et originali peccato* [5], Rome, 1924.
De Verbo Incarnato, Rome, 1904.

Blass, F. *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch* [2], Göttingen, 1902.

Bousset, W. *Die Religion des Judentums im neutestamentlichem Zeitalter* [2], Berlin, 1906.

Bovon, J. *Théologie du Nouveau Testament*, [2] 2 vol. Lausanne, 1905.

Boysson de, E. *La loi et la foi*, Paris, 1912.

Bruce, A. B. *St. Paul's Conception of Christianity*, Edinburgh, 1896.

Burton De Witt, E. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Galations*, Edinburgh, 1921.

Callan, C. J. *The Epistles of St. Paul*, vol. I, New York, 1922,

Camerlynck, A. *Commentarius in Actus Apostolorum*, Bruges, 1910.

Campbell, M. *The Nature of the Atonement* [6], London, 1890.

Carré, H. B. *Paul's Doctrine of Redemption*, New York, 1914.

Clemen, C. *Die christliche Lehre von der Sünde*, Göttingen, 1897.

Colon, J. B. *Justice et justification d'après le Nouveau Testament*, Moulins, 1913.

Cornely, R. *Commentarius in S. Pauli Apostoli epistolas:*
Epistola ad Romanos, Paris, 1896.
Epistola prima ad Corinthios, Paris, 1895.
Epistola ad Corinthios altera et ad Galatas, Paris, 1892.

Cremer, H. *Biblisch-theologisches Wörterbuch der neutestamentlichen Gräcität* [9], Gotha, 1902.

Dale, R. W. *The Atonement* [25], London, 1909.

DEISSMANN, A. *Die neutestamentliche Formel, "in Christo Jesu"*, Marburg, 1892.
Licht vom Osten [3], Tübingen, 1909.
St. Paul, a Study in Social and Religious History, (E.T.), New York, 1912.

DENNEY, J. *The Christian Doctrine of Reconciliation*, New York, 1918.
The Death of Christ, London, 1911.
Studies in Theology, London, 1895.

DIBELIUS, M. *Die Geisterwelt im Glauben des Paulus*, Göttingen, 1909.

DOWNER, A. C. *Mission and Ministration of the Spirit*, Edinburgh, 1909.

DU BOSE, W. P. *The Gospel according to St. Paul*, New York, 1907.

DUPERRAY, J. *Le Christ dans la vie chrétienne d'après saint Paul* [2], Lyon, 1922.

EVERETT, C. C. *The Gospel of Paul*, Boston, 1893.

EVERLINGE, O. *Die paulinische Angelologie und Dämonologie*, Göttingen, 1888.

FEINE, P. *Theologie des neuen Testaments*[3], Leipzig, 1919.

FELDER, P. H. *Jesus Christus* [2], Paderborn, 1920.

FERRARI, F. *L'uomo irredento in san Paolo*, Bologna, 1922.

FOLEY, G. C. *Anselm's Theory of Atonement*, London, 1909.

FONCK, L. *Quaestiones Paulinae*, Rome, 1910.

FORSYTH, P. T. *The Cruciality of the Cross*, London, 1909.
The Work of Christ, London, 1910.
The Atonement in Modern Religious Thought, London, 1912.

FRICKE, G. A. *De mente dogmatica loci paulini ad Rom.* v, 12 *sq.* Lipsiae, 1880.

GARDNER, P. *Religious Experience of St. Paul*, London, 1911.

GARRIGOU-LAGRANGE, R. *Dieu, son existence et sa nature*[4], Paris, 1923.

GARVIE, A. *Studies of Paul and His Gospel*, London, 1911.

GOGUEL, M. *L'Apôtre Paul et Jésus-Christ*, Paris, 1904.

GORE, C. *St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans*, London, 1899.
St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians, London, 1900.
Belief in Christ[4], London, 1924.

GRAFE, E. *Die paulinische Lehre vom Gesetz nach den vier Hauptbriefen* [2], Freiburg, im B., 1893.

GREEN, S. G. *Handbook to the Grammar of the New Testament*, London, 1907.

GRIMM, C. L. W. *Lexicon Graeco-Latinum in libros Novi Testamenti*[4], Lipsiae, 1903.

GROSJEAN, G. *La rédemption d'après Franz Leenhardt*, Paris, 1923,

GUNKEL, H. *Die Wirkungen des heiligen Geistes*[3], Göttingen, 1909.

HALL, F. J. *Evolution and the Fall*, New York, 1910.

HARNACK, A. *Das Wesen des Christentums*, Leipzig, 1908.

HEADLAM, A. C. *St. Paul and Christianity* [2], London, 1915.

HEITMÜLLER, W. *Taufe und Abendmahl bei Paulus*, Göttingen, 1903.

HITCHCOCK, G. S. *The Epistle to the Ephesians*, London, 1913.

HITCHCOCK, F. K. M. *The Atonement and Modern Thought*, London, 1911.

HOLLMAN, G. *Die Bedenkung des Todes Jesu*, Tübingen, 1901.

HOLTZMANN, H.-J. *Lehrbuch der neutestamentlichen Theologie* [2], Tübingen, 1911.

HOLTZMEISTER, U. *II Cor.* III, 17 : *Dominus autem Spiritus est*, Innsbruck, 1908.

JACQUIER, E. *Histoire des livres du Nouveau Testament*, 4 vol., Paris, 1904.

JAMES, W. *Varieties of Religious Experience*, London, 1902.

JOHNSON, E. W. *Suffering, Punishment, and Atonement*, London, 1919.

JOYCE, G. H. *The Catholic Doctrine of Grace*, London, 1920.

JUNCKER, G. *Die Ethik des Apostels Paulus*, Halle, 1904.

KENNEDY, A. A. *The Theology of the Epistles*, New York, 1920.

KNABENBAUER, J. *Epistola ad Ephesios, ad Philippenses, et ad Colossenses*, Paris, 1912,

KNOKE, F. *Der christliche Glaube nach Paulus*. Osnabrück, 1922,

KNOX, E. A. *The Glad Tidings of Reconciliation*, London, 1916.

KUHL, E. *Der Brief des Paulus an die Römer*, Leipzig, 1913,

KURZE, G. *Der Engels- und Teufelsglaube des Apostels Paulus*. Freiburg im B., 1915.

LAGRANGE, M. J. *Épître aux Romains*, Paris, 1916.
Épître aux Galates, Paris, 1918.

LAMINNE, J. *La rédemption*, Bruxelles, 1911.

LAMIROY, H. *De essentia ss. missae, sacrificii*, Louvain, 1919.

LATTEY-KEATING, *The Westminster Version of the Sacred Scriptures, The New Testament*, vol. III, London. 1921.

LEBRETON, J. *Les origines du dogme, de la Trinité*, Paris, 1910 [3], 1919 [4].

LEMONNYER, A. *Épîtres de saint Paul*, 2 vol., Paris, 1908.

LEPICIER, A. M. *Tractatus de peccato originali*, Paris, 1911.

LIDGETT, J. S. *The Spiritual Principle of the Atonement*, London, 1914.

LIETZMANN, H. *Die Briefe des Apostels Paulus:*
An die Römer[2], Tübingen, 1919.
An die Galater[2], Tübingen, 1921.

LIGHTFOOT, J. B. *St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians*[5], London. 1880.
St. Paul's Epistle to the Colossians and Philemon[5], London, 1880.

MACKINTOSH, R. *Historic Theories of Atonement*, London, 1920.

MC DOWALL, S. A. *Evolution and the Need of Atonement*[2], Cambridge, 1914.

MEDEBIELLE, P. A. *L'expiation dans l'Ancien et le Nouveau Testament*, 2 vol., Rome, 1924.

MENEGOZ, E. *La mort de Jésus et le dogme de l'expiation*, Paris, 1905.

MILLIGAN, W. *The Resurrection of Our Lord*[2], London, 1884.

MOBERLY, R. C. *Atonement and Personality*, London, 1901.

MOFFATT, J. *Paul and Paulinism*, London, 1910.

MORGAN, W. *The Religion and Theology of Paul*, Edinburg, 1917.

MOULE, A. C. *The Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans*, London, 1894.

MOULTON, J. H. *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*[3], Edinburgh, 1908.

MOZLEY, J. K. *The Doctrine of the Atonement*, London, 1915.

MUTH, J. *Die Heilstat Christi als stellvertretende Genugtuung*, Munich, 1904.

Ohleyer, L. J. *The Pauline Formula ' Induere Christum ' with Special Reference to the Works of St. John Chrysostom*, Washington, 1921.

Orchard, W. E. *Modern Theories of Sin*, London, 1909.

Orr, J. *Sin as a Problem of Today*, London, 1910.

Oxenham, H. C. *Catholic Doctrine of the Atonement* [2], London, 1869.

Palmieri, D. *Tractatus de peccato originali et de immaculato Beatae Virginis Deiparae conceptu* [2], Rome, 1904.

Peake, A. S. *The Quintessence of Paulinism*, Manchester, 1918.

Pesch, C. *Das Sühneleiden unseres göttlichen Erlösers*, Freiburg im B., 1916.

Praelectiones dogmaticae [5], 5 vol., Freiburg im B., 1922.

Pfleiderer, O. *Der Paulinismus* [2], Leipzig, 1890.

Das Urchristentum [2], Berlin, 1902.

Pohle, J. *Soteriology* [3], St. Louis, 1919.

Prat, F. *La théologie de saint Paul*, vol. I[9], 1920, vol. II[6], 1923, Paris.

Ramsay, A. *The Cities of St. Paul*, New York, 1908.

A Historical Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians, London, 1900.

Pauline Studies, New York, 1914.

The Teaching of St. Paul in Terms of the Present Day, London, 1914.

Rashdall, H. *The Idea of Atonement in Christian Theology*, London, 1920.

Ritschl, A. *Die christliche Lehre von der Rechtfertigung und Versöhnung* [4], vol. I, 1903, vol. II, 1900, vol. III, 1895, Bonn.

Rivière, J. *Le dogme de la rédemption, Essai d'étude historique* [2], Paris, 1905.

Le dogme de la rédemption, étude théologique, Paris, 1914.

Roberts, G. *Salvation through Atonement*, London, 1910.

Robertson, A. T. *A Grammar of the Greek Testament in the Light of Historical Research*, New York, 1914.

Rostron, S. N. *The Christology of St. Paul*, London, 1912.

Sabatier, A. *L'Apôtre Paul* [4], Paris, 1912.

La doctrine de l'expiation et son évolution historique, Paris, 1903.

Sanday, W. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* [5], Edinburgh, 1907.

Schürer, E. *Geschichte des Jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi* [3], Leipzig, 1893.

Scott, E. F. *The Spirit in the New Testament*, London, 1923.

Scott, M. *The Atonement*, London, 1910.

Shears, H. *The Gospel according to St. Paul*, Oxford, 1920.

Snowden, P. L. *The Atonement and Ourselves*, London, 1919.

Somerville, D. *St. Paul's Conception of Christ*, Edinburgh, 1897.

Souter, A. *A Pocket-Lexicon to the Greek New Testament*, Oxford, 1916.

Staab, K. *Die Lehre von der stellvertretenden Genugtuung Christi*, Paderborn, 1908.

Stevens, G. W. *The Christian Doctrine of Salvation*, London, 1905.

Swete, H. B. *The Holy Spirit in the New Testament* [2], London, 1921.

TENNANT, F. R. *The Origin and Propagation of Sin*, Cambridge, 1902.

TERRY, M. S. *Biblical Dogmatics, an Exposition of the Principal Doctrines of the Holy Scriptures*, London, 1906.

THACKERAY, H. *The Relation of St. Paul to Contemporary Jewish Thought*, London, 1900.

THOMSOM, J. A. *The Bible of Nature*, Edinburgh, 1908.

TITIUS, A. *Der Paulinismus unter dem Gesichtspunkt der Seligkeit*, Tübingen, 1900.

TIXERONT, J. *Histoire des dogmes*, vol. I[6], 1909, vol. II[4], 1912, vol. III[3], 1912, Paris.

TOBAC, E. *Le problème de la justification dans saint Paul*, Louvain, 1908.

TOUSSAINT, C. *Épître aux Romains*, Paris, 1913.

TYMMS, T. V. *The Christian Idea of Atonement*, London, 1904.

VAN CROMBRUGGHE, C. *De soteriologiae christianae primis fontibus*, Louvain, 1905.

VAN STEENKISTE, J. A. *Commentarius in s. Pauli epistolas*[6], Bruges, 1899.

VOSTÉ, J. M. *Commentarius in epistolam ad Ephesios*, Rome, 1921.

WALKER, L. J. *Why God became Man*, London, 1922.

WALKER, W. L. *The Cross and the Kingdom, as Viewed by Christ Himself, and in the Light of Modern Evolution*, Edinburgh, 1902.

WEINEL, H. *Biblische Theologie des neuen Testaments*[3], Tübingen, 1921.

WENDT, H. H. *System der christliche Lehre*[2], Göttingen, 1920.

WEISS, B. *Biblical Theology of the New Testament* (E. T.), 2 vol., Edinburgh, 1885.

WEISS, J. *Die Schriften des neuen Testaments*[2], 2 vol., Göttingen, 1907.

WESTCOTT, F. B. *St. Paul and Justification*, London, 1913.

WETZEL, D. *Grundlinien der Versöhnungslehre*[2], Leipzig, 1906.

WIESER, J. *Pauli Apostoli doctrina de justificatione*, Tridenti, 1874.

WILLIAMS, H. W. *St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans*, London, 1896.

WILLIAMS, J. H. *The Divinity of Christ in the New Testament*, London, 1923.

WILLIAMS, W. E. J. *A Plea for a Re-consideration of St. Paul's Doctrine of Justification*, London, 1912.

WOODS, C. E. *The Gospel of Rightness*, London, 1909.

WORKMAN, G. C. *At Onement or Reconciliation with God*, New York, 1911.

ZAHN, T. *Der Brief des Paulus an die Galater*, Leipzig, 1907.

ZANECCHIA, P. D. *Il sacrificio redentivo a Jerusalemme*, Grottaferrata, 1913.

ZORELL, F. *Novi Testamenti lexicon graecum*, Paris, 1911.

CONTENTS.

	Page
PREFACE	VII
BIBLIOGRAPHY	XVIII
I. Abbreviations	XVIII
II. Articles in Periodicals and Dictionaries	XIX
III. Commentaries, Books, Lexicons, Grammars, etc.	XXII
CONTENTS	XXVII

PART I.

HUMANITY BEFORE THE REDEMPTION. — THE SERVITUDE OF SIN.

PRELIMINARY	1
CHAPTER I. THE PAULINE CONCEPTION OF SIN	3
Art. I. The nature of sin	3
Art. II. The universal Prevalence of Sin	7
Art. III. The Causes of Sin	14
I. The Psychological Cause, the Sin-Principle	14
A. The Pauline Conceptions of Σάρξ and Σῶμα	16
B. The Pauline Conceptions of Πνεῦμα, Ψυχή, and Νοῦς.	19
C. The Flesh and the Sin-Principle	22
II. The Historical Cause of Sin: the Transgression of Adam	28
A. The Pauline Doctrine of Original Sin in Rom. V, 12-19.	30
B. Comparison of Rom. V, 12-19 with Rom. VII, 7 ff., I Cor. XV, 45 ff., Gal. IV, 8 and Rom. I, 18-32.	40
C. Modern Theories of Original Sin	44
(1) The Evolutionist Theory of Original Sin	45
(2) Psychological Theories of the Origin of Sin	53
III. The Ultimate Cause of Sin: Satan	57
CHAPTER II. THE AUXILIARIES OF SIN	59
Art. I. The Spirit Powers.	59
Art. II. The "Elements of the World"	65
I. The meaning of Στοιχεῖον and Κόσμος.	66
II. Τὰ Στοιχεῖα τοῦ Κόσμου in the Epistle to the Galatians.	68
III. Τὰ Στοιχεῖὰ τοῦ Κόσμου in the Epistle to the Colossians.	71
IV. Comparison, Résumé, and Conclusions	75
V. Modern Theories concerning Τὰ Στοιχεῖα τοῦ Κόσμου	78
Art. III. The Mosaic Law.	81
I. Occasion of Saint Paul's Discussion of the Law	88
II, The Pauline Usage of the Term, Νόμος	88
III. The Law, Not a Means of Justification. — Historical Arguments.	95
A. Abraham's Justification by Faith	97
B. Abraham's Justification a Gratuitous Gift	100
C. Abraham's Spiritual Paternity Independent of the Law.	103
D. Abraham's Promise Superior to the Law	106

Page

IV. The Law, Not a Means of Justification. — Psychological Arguments 110
A. The Law a Cause of the Knowledge of Sin 110
B. The Law a Cause of the Multiplication of Sin . . . 112
C. The Law a Cause of Wrath and of Death 115
D. The Law in its Relation to the Flesh 116
V. The Law a Jailer and a Pedagogue 121

CHAPTER III. THE REIGN OF SIN 125
Art. I. Humanity under Divine Wrath 125
Art. II. The Reign of Death. 130
I. The Pauline Doctrine Concerning Death 130
II. The Pauline Teaching on Death and Modern Science . 135
Art. III. The Ever-Expanding Empire of Slavery to Sin . . . 137

PART II.

THE REDEMPTION.

PRELIMINARY 143

CHAPTER I. THE PERSON OF THE REDEEMER 147
Art. I. Christology and Modern Criticism 147
Art. II. Jesus Christ God 172
Art. III. Jesus Christ Man 191
Art. IV. Jesus Christ Head of the New Humanity 208

CHAPTER II. THE REDEEMING WORK OF CHRIST. 225
Art. I. Christ's Redeeming Death 227
I. Constitutive Elements of the Redeeming Death of Christ . 227
A. The Moral Element: Love and Obedience of the Redeemer 228
B. The Penal Element: Sufferings and Death of the Redeemer 231
(1) Modern Penal Theories 236
(2) Theory of Vicarious Penitence or Confession . . 248
II. Different aspects or Modes of Christ's Redeeming Death. 252
A. Vicarious Satisfaction 253
B. Sacrifice 256
(1) Reconciliation 263
(2) The "Moral-Influence" Theory 268
C. Ransom or Redemption 286
(1) Redemption from Sin 286
(2) Redemption from the Mosaic Law 293
(3) Redemption from the Spirit-Powers 304
Art. II. The Resurrection 310

PART III.

HUMANITY AFTER THE REDEMPTION. — THE LIBERTY OF THE SPIRIT.

CHAPTER I. SUBJECTIVE APPROPRIATION OF THE EFFECTS OF THE REDEMPTION 321
Art. I. Faith 321
Preliminary 321

Page

I. The Nature of Faith 323
II. The Object, Origin, and Efficacy of Faith 336
Art. II. Baptism 345
I. Baptism a Mystic Death and Resurrection 346
II. Baptism and Faith 352

CHAPTER II. INCORPORATION INTO CHRIST. — THE CHURCH . . . 357
Art. I. Analogies of the Church 358
Art. II. Notes of the Church 371

CHAPTER III. THE ERA OF THE SPIRIT 380
Art. I. The Spirit, the Principle of the Christian's Moral Life. . 381
Art. II. Adoptive Filiation 382
Art. III. Justice and Justification 393
I. The "Justice of God", Δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ 394
A. Anthropological, not Theological 397
B. Real, not Forensic 398
C. Actual, not Eschatological 404
D. Inherent, not Imputed 407
II. Justification, Δικαίωσις. 409
Art. IV. Glorification 413

ALPHABETICAL INDEX 421
EXEGETICAL INDEX. 428

PART I

Humanity before the Redemption. — The Servitude of Sin.

PRELIMINARY.

Before we discuss Saint Paul's doctrine on the Redemption, we must carefully consider his teaching concerning sin. Since the Redemption was the divinely ordained means of reparing sin, no one can understand the former without understanding the latter. They are as closely related as a problem and its solution. The remedy is determined by the evil to be cured ; hence, the Apostle's conception of sin will determine his presentation of the Redemption. If sin is a misery, the Redemption is a mercy. If sin is a degradation, the Redemption is a restoration. If sin is a bondage, the Redemption is a liberation. If sin is a fault, the Redemption is an expiation. If sin is an offence, the Redemption is a satisfaction and a reconciliation. If sin is a work of death propagated by carnal generation, the Redemption is a work of life communicated by spiritual regeneration. And if sin is a mystery of iniquity, the Redemption is a mystery of goodness and love.

Besides, such is the unity of Christian truth that no particular opinion can be adopted, and no particular dogma changed or rejected, except by modifying the whole of that truth. Christian doctrines are not a collocation of isolated conceptions without influence on one another ; they have an internal connection and coherence binding them into a whole, so that none can be tampered with or altered without injury to the rest. Peculiarly is this the case with the doctrine concerning sin, on which is based the correlated doctrine of man's indispensable need of

Redemption and of spiritual renewal. If the facts of sin are inadequately studied or misconceived, the all important work accomplished by Christ's Passion and Death will be necessarily and proportionately misjudged and misrepresented. Saint Paul's soteriology is admittedly profound, rich, and central in his theological system ; to appreciate it adequately we must first determine what in the Apostle's mind constituted the essence of sin, what are its origin, its extent, and its effects.

CHAPTER I.

The Pauline Conception of Sin.

Art. I. — THE NATURE OF SIN.

Saint Paul has an extensive vocabulary to denote sin or sins. In the Epistle to the Romans where he elaborates his doctrine he uses ten general terms to designate sin : ἀκαθαρσία = uncleanness, impurity, ἀνομία = lawlessness, and especially disobedience to the Divine Law, ἀσέβεια = impiety, irreverence towards God, ἀδικία = iniquity, and injustice in general, πλάνη = a wandering from the way, error, παρακοή = disobedience, παράπτωμα = a falling away, a lapse, a slip or false step, παράβασις = literally, a walking along by the line but not exactly according to it, a transgression, ἁμάρτημα = sin as an act, and ἁμαρτία = literally, missing the mark. Besides these, Saint Paul uses specific terms for different sins (Rom. I, 29, 31), and a great number of words denoting and describing various personal sins, sensual, social, ethical, and religious (Rom. I, 18 ; III, 20). In First and in Second Corinthians, gross sins are dealt with such as divisions, strife, envy, incest, adultery, drunkenness, etc.

The Apostle nowhere gives us a formal definition of sin, but by studying the term which he most frequently employs, namely, the noun ἁμαρτία, we can determine his conception of it. In classical Greek ἁμαρτία, ἁμαρτάνειν, are common in the lighter sense of " missing the mark or an aim ", or of " error in judgment or opinion ", but in the graver sense of wrong-doing they are rare. But when we turn to the Bible, to the LXX (where ἁμαρτία = חַטָּא, חַטָּאָה, חַטָּאת, עָוֹן) and to the New Testament alike, this proportion is reversed, and " to sin " is to miss the mark religiously and ethically. Besides, we must consider the deepening of meaning which the words have undergone through the theological context in which they are placed. Two other words used by Saint Paul show us what the mark missed is : ἀδικία, unrighteousness, lack of conformity to the Will of God, and ἀνομία, lawlessness, a failure to live or act according to the standard of God's law. Παράβασις

emphasizes the same idea. Hence the mark missed is the Divine law.

Sin, however, is not merely a negation, it is a positive quality also. It is a παράπτωμα, a fall from God, involving a recoil into the sphere of self or of nature. This is graphically illustrated by Saint Paul in his description of the idolatry, sensuality, and immorality of the pagan world. The Gentiles knew God (Rom. I, 19, 20), refused to worship Him or give Him thanks (Rom. I, 21), began to worship creatures rather than the Creator, and so fell into idolatry (Rom. I, 22, 25). This wrong idea in turn degraded them into the grossest sensuality and blackest immorality (Rom. I, 26, 32).

Sin for Saint Paul, therefore, is not a mere defect, the coming short of an ideal, the mark of an imperfect development, but a positive act calling forth a positive reaction. It is diametrically opposed to the holiness, justice, and love of God's Being. It is a personal offence against a personal God. It is impossible to have an adequate conception of sin without an adequate conception of God [1]. It is because of his belief in a Holy God that sin is such an intense reality to Saint Paul. Hence the term which he uses to express God's attitude towards sin is " wrath ", ὀργή, i. e. that in God which stands opposed to man's obduracy, disobedience, and sin. To bring out further the nature of sin, the Apostle uses another term, ὑπόδικος, " to be under judgment ". Thus in Rom. III, 19 he says : οἴδαμεν δὲ ὅτι ὅσα ὁ νόμος λέγει τοῖς ἐν τῷ νόμῳ λαλεῖ, ἵνα πᾶν στόμα φραγῇ καὶ ὑπόδικος γένηται πᾶς ὁ κόσμος τῷ θεῷ. Man by sin is " under judgment ", " under sentence ". He is found to have broken God's law, and so is guilty and liable to punishment. This guilt Saint Paul considers as having different degrees according to the light against which man sins (Rom. I, 19 ; II, 12, 24).

From the above it is clear that the fundamental notion of sin according to the Pauline Epistles is opposition to God ; sin is an act against the Divine law as this is manifested either through Nature or Conscience or through positive revela-

1. LIDGETT, *The Spiritual Principle of the Atonement*, says, pp. 243-244 : " Sin can be defined only by reference to God ; for it is an offense against Him, and against Him only. But, as towards Him, it may be defined in its relation either to His authority, or to His commandments, or to His ideal for men. Towards the first it is rebellion ; towards the second it is transgression ; towards the third it is failure, shortcoming, a missing the mark ".

tion [1]. This opposition itself can take many forms and be directed towards different objects which themselves, however, are considered in their relation to God. Accordingly, sin will also bear different names, such as ἁμαρτία, παράβασις, παράπτωμα, ἀδικία, ἀνομία, ἀκαθαρσία, etc.

This interpretation of the Pauline doctrine of sin has recently been questioned by an Oxford professor, H. Shears [2]. Assuming that the essential notion of sin is error, he maintains that " St. Paul's use of the word ἁμαρτία, does not correspond to our use of the word *sin* at all, but approaches far more nearly to that use to which language points as the original one [3] ". By what he calls a familiar process of " stringing " texts together he attempts to establish a fundamental distinction between error, ἁμαρτία, and wilful sin, παράβασις ; thus Saint Paul says : οὗ δέ οὐκ ἔστιν νόμος, οὐδὲ παράβασις (Rom. IV, 15), and ἄχρι γὰρ νόμου ἁμαρτία ἦν ἐν κόσμῳ (Rom. V, 13) ; διὰ γὰρ νόμου ἐπίγνωσις ἁμαρτίας (Rom. III, 20), and τὴν ἁμαρτίαν οὐκ ἔγνων εἰ μὴ διὰ νόμου (Rom. VII, 7). *Sin*, according to the author, was converted into *transgression* only when the Law came (Gal. III, 19). In regard to this opinion it may be noted that Shears in his book does not sufficiently distinguish the Pauline usage of ἁμαρτία and of ἡ ἁμαρτία. Furthermore,

1. Cf. ZORELL, *Novi Testamenti lexicon graecum*, p. 32 ; this fundamental character of sin is recognized by many Protestant theologians ; thus KIRN, art. *Sünde*, PRE, Vol. XIX, p. 136, writes " Die religiose Beziehung der Sünde, der Widerspruch gegen Gott wird von Paulus nachdrücklich hervorgehoben und bildet immer den Hintergrund seiner Aussagen " ; so too GOGUEL, *L'Apôtre Paul et Jésus-Christ*, p. 131, says : " le péché apparaît, chez Paul, comme ce qui est opposé à la justice, et d'une manière plus particulière, à la justice de Dieu " ; cf. also BERTRAND, *Une nouvelle conception de la rédemption*, pp. 230-231.

According to RITSCHL, however, sin is diffidence and indifference as to God and an act of egoism in regard to men. In his *Rechtfertigung und Versöhnung* [4], Vol. III, p. 317, he says : " Das Gute im christlichen Sinne ist das Reich Gottes... die Sünde ist nun die Gegentheil des Guten, so fern sie aus Gleichgiltigkeit oder Misztrauen gegen Gott Selbsucht ist und sich auf die Güter untergeordneten Ranges richtet, ohne deren Unterordnung unter das höchste Gut zu beabsichtigen ". This conception of sin is clearly opposed to the Pauline notion of sin as explained above. Besides, it is not psychological, since lack of confidence in God is the logical fruit of egoism instead of being its cause, and secondly it is too intellectualistic ; to pretend that moral evil consists primarily in a lack of confidence in God is to present sin as an act of ignorance, an involuntary error of the human mind, rather than a conscious transgression of the moral law.

2. *The Gospel according to St. Paul*, pp. 1-49.

3. Ibid., p. 2.

while Saint Paul indeed says that there were no transgressions before the Mosaic Law (Rom. IV, 15), a positive written law, he does not say that there was no law at all in the world before the Sinaitic legislation. The Gentiles, to whose position that of the Jew before the Law was similar, had the law of their reason, which the Apostle considered as a preformation and participation of the Mosaic Law, promulgated in their hearts, and enabling them to fulfill the essential precepts of the Law (Rom. IV, 14, 15). Without the Law there was actual sin in the world (Rom. V, 13), but there was no transgression, which is a violation not only of the natural law but of the positive written law, and is consequently the more heinous. In Rom. VII, 7 ff. Saint Paul is describing the psychological experience of a Jewish boy. For the Israelite not to know the Mosaic Law was likewise not to know the natural law, since he was from the very beginning of his moral conscience instructed and directed by the Law.

A still more profound alteration of the notion of sin has been brought about by the modern theory of evolution. This theory pictures man as having arisen bodily and mentally by slow gradations from the animal, and as subsisting through countless milleniums in a stage of semi-brutishness and savagery. Modern evolutionists emphasize the upward tendency of all things, and hence sin is considered by them as merely a stage in the process, i. e., sin is good in the making ; it is an uneliminated brute-inheritance which the race in its ceaseless struggle upwards is unceasingly throwing off. " According to the most scientific form of Christian teaching ", says Hitchcock [1], " sin is something that has arrested the development and interfered with the ascent of man ". Sin is simply an evolutionary mistake, a failure to " prefer the more distant aim [2] ", and to follow " the higher law which shone [3] " upon man. This theory — do we need to say so — really explains away the notion of sin altogether. Sin, as we have seen above, implies relation to God, but here there is no knowledge of God or possibility of right relation to Him. Sin postulates freedom, but here man is from the first a slave to animal impulse and passion ; sin implies voluntary departure from rectitude but

1. *The Atonement and Modern Thought*, p. 2.
2. Scott, *The Atonement*, p. 365.
3. Walker, W. L., *The Cross and the Kingdom*, p. 300.

here it is made a necessity [1]. Moreover, what kind of Redemption can be conceived as corresponding to these and similar notions of sin ? Certainly not that of Saint Paul as it is presented to us in his Epistles in all its richness and variety, but rather that vague and denatured conception, so popular among contemporary Protestant theologians, known as the " moral-influence " theory, which reduces the whole of Christ's redeeming work merely to its psychological influence on our lives.

Art. II. — THE UNIVERSAL PREVALENCE OF SIN.

Having seen above what for Saint Paul constituted the fundamental notion of sin, let us now inquire to what extent he considered sin present in humanity before Christ and outside of His influence. The Apostle unhesitatingly and clearly affirms the universality of sin in both the Jewish and Gentile world. All men were really constituted sinners by the transgression of Adam: " Therefore as by the offence of one, unto all men to condemnation, so also by the justice of one, unto all men to justification of life " (Rom. v, 18 ; cf. Eph. II, 3). The testimony of the Scriptures and of historical experience alike similarly lead the Apostle to conclude to the general prevalence of sin : " All have sinned, and do need the glory of God " (Rom. III, 23). Again, he says that " God hath concluded all in unbelief that he may have mercy on all " (Rom. XI, 32), and that " the scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise, by the faith of Jesus Christ, might be given to them that believe " (Gal. III, 22). Both Jews and Gentiles are under the dominion of sin : " For we have charged both Jews and Greeks that they are all under sin " (Rom. III, 9). Punishment is in store for every man who commits sin : " Tribulation and anguish upon every soul of man that worketh evil, of the Jew first, and also of the Greek " (Rom. II, 9).

Saint Paul divides humanity into two classes according as they have received a positive law from God or not, and applies thereupon his thesis of the universality of sin to the two categories. First of all the Gentiles are sinners : by their very

1. Cf. Denney, *The Christian Doctrine of Reconciliation*, pp. 197-198, Roberts, *Salvation through Atonement*, p. 8.

birth in paganism they are placed in a state of ignorance of the Law of God. They are ἀνόμοι, ἄθεοι and ἁμαρτωλοί (Gal. II, 15, Eph. II, 1 ff., 12), who are dead because of their offences, and who do not seek after justice (Rom. IX, 30). All the Corinthians before their conversion are considered as sinners (I Cor. XV, 17). But it is especially in Rom. I, 18-32, that the Apostle shows us the Gentiles as wholly under the dominion of sin. The heathen nations, taught by Nature and Conscience, have failed to attain δικαιοσύνη. Because they repressed the promptings of truth by their unfaithfulness to natural light, their moral history is a revelation of God's ὀργή against them. The neglect and abuse of the light of conscience and of the natural knowledge of God resulted in ignorance, folly, and idolatry. In this punishment of the pagans, in this their abandonment to the moral consequences of their unfaithfulness three stages are marked : impurity of life, sensual degradation, and an active but reprobate mental disposition towards intellectual and moral truth [1].

And the Jew who abhors and condemns the gross sins of the heathen is himself no better (Rom. II, 17 ; III, 18). For in passing judgment on another he condemns himself, because he practises the very things which he denounces, and is therefore without excuse before the justice of God. The κρῖμα τοῦ θεοῦ is regulated by the standard of moral truth, and is visited upon all who practise such sins, be they Jews or Gentiles. Though the Jew may fancy himself to be in a privileged position, he will not escape from the range of Divine Judgment. He cannot contemptuously estimate Divine Mercy as merely easy, graduated indifference to sin, because this attribute of God is only an impelling force towards repentance. God will render to each man according to his works, and will take no account of outward distinctions between man and man. His judgment of men will be according to their varying lights and opportunities in life : " For whosoever have sinned without the law,

1. GARVIE, *Studies of Paul and His Gospel*, p. 150 (cf. also pp. 238-239), maintains that " it is now impossible for us to hold with Paul that polytheism and the accompanying idolatry were a deliberate choice of a lower religion when a higher religion was equally possible. We regard these as stages in the development of the religious consciousness of the divine ". Statements like these, which are unaccompanied by even a semblance of proof, are arbitrary, and consequently cannot claim serious consideration.

shall perish without the law ; and whosoever have sinned in the law, shall be judged by the law " (Rom. II, 12).

This Pauline doctrine of the universality of sin is denied by Shears [1]. This writer regards the whole period of which the book of Genesis treats as one in which God never called man to account for sin and in which man lived in entire ignorance of sin. It was only by the introduction of the Mosaic Law that man began to have an idea of right and wrong, although Saint Paul's method of bringing about this crucial change seems desperately crude to the Oxford professor. The author bases his theory on the two speechs of Saint Paul recorded in the Acts of the Apostles, one to the men of Lystra (Acts XIV, 15, 17), the other to the Athenians (Acts XVII, 22, 31). The discourse at Athens we are told is the more important because it was delivered in answer to a direct appeal, " may we know what this new doctrine whereof thou speakest is ", and because it was delivered after a considerable period of missionary activity. The speech at Lystra, on the other hand, was occasioned by a sudden emergency, and, besides, occurred at the very outset of Saint Paul's missionary career as Apostle of the Gentiles. The evidence of Saint Paul's recorded speech to the Athenians seems to show that at the time of its deliverance the theory of a total ignorance of sin on the part of the Gentiles together with the non-imputation of guilt in their case on the part of God, was dominant in the Apostle's mind [2].

But the arguments whereby Shears establishes his theory are very fragile indeed. He strongly insists on the Apostle's statement that " God overlooked the times of ignorance ", τοὺς μέν οὖν χρόνους τῆς ἀγνοίας ὑπεριδὼν ὁ θεός (Acts XVII, 30). This assertion of Saint Paul, however, we may remark, is nothing but a *captatio benevolentiae*, an *ars oratoria* [3]. Standing in front of the Acropolis which was filled with

1. O. c. pp. 9-34.
2. O. c. pp. 10, 12.
3. The character of Saint Paul's discourse at Athens, its peculiar tact and aptness for the occasion, is well brought out by CAMERLYNCK in his *Actus Apostolorum*, pp. 331-332 : " S. Paulus miram ostendit prudentiam, quum auditorum ingenio se accommodet, ut eos sibi conciliet, et ad Christum perducat. Quando Judaeis fidem praedicabat, ut antea vidimus, *fiebat tamquam Judaeus ut Judaeos lucraretur;* nunc loquens Gentilibus, et viris quidem cultioris ingenii, tamquam philosophus ratiocinatur, sermone utens plane Attico, orationemque suam, tum sententiarum gravitate, quam ver-

temples and statues of gods, nay, perhaps in front of the very statue of Minerva, Saint Paul by reprehending his auditors would have seriously provoked them. The effect which the main point of the Apostle's discourse produced on his hearers is additional proof that such would have been the result. The Apostle wished neither to offend nor to flatter them, but to address them prudently, as is already evident in v. 22, ὡς δεισιδαιμονεστέρους. Yet in spite of the apparent consideration for his listeners on the part of Saint Paul, it must have been a bitter experience for the former to hear their proud Athens accused of ignorance. And for this ignorance they must " all and everywhere " repent (v. 30) ; the how and why of this penance is contained in these words : a turning in faith to the Risen One because of the future judgment (v. 31 ; cf. Rom. II, 5 ; III, 25). Hence the Apostle by no means considers the ignorance which he denounces as inculpable. Shears indeed tries to weaken the force of this argument by maintaining that μετανοεῖν has a " purely negative " reference to the past [1]. If this be true, why does Saint Paul speak of a judgment at all ? Why does he not consider their past history as simply closed ?

Shears insists, however, that he who, when opposing idolatry in cultivated Athens, assured his hearers that God overlooked the times of ignorance, whose Gospel message to the men of Lystra included the announcement of " a living God who made heaven and earth ", could not, at the same time that he delivered these speeches, have written to the heathen : " Because that which is known of God is manifest in them. For God hath manifested it unto them. For the invisible things of him, from the creation of the world, are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made ; his eternal power also and divinity, so that they are inexcusable " (Rom. I, 19, 20). The passage in Romans consequently refers not to the Gentiles but to the Jews [2]. For us, however, it is difficult to see how anyone who studies Rom. I, 19, 20 and the two discourses in the Acts

borum elegantia, mirifice exornans. Forma hic toto coelo differt ab orationibus ejusdem Pauli ad Judaeos quae in Act. referuntur. Inde etiam fit, quod Paulus in ep. ad Rom. I, 19, 32 alio modo eamdem doctrinam proponat, neque ita moderate ac in nostro loco paganismum dijudicet " ; cf. also PRAT, *La théologie de saint Paul*, vol. I[9], p. 61 ff.

1. O. c. n. p. 13.
2. O. c. p. 15 f.

in their entirety could possibly maintain that there is an opposition of view-point between them. In the speech at Athens Saint Paul clearly says that in the wise government of the world and of the human race the mind of God was to lead to a knowledge of Himself · " And (God) hath made of one all mankind, to dwell upon the whole face of the earth, determining appointed times, and the limits of their habitations, that they should seek God if happily they may feel after him or find him, although he be not far from every one of us " (Acts XVII, 26, 27). But just as in the Epistle to the Romans the Apostle says : διότι γνόντες τὸν θεὸν, οὐχ ὡς θεὸν ἐδόξασαν (I, 21), so also at Athens, εἰ ἄρα γε (Acts XVII, 27), — the Gentiles did not profess what they could and should know. And what do we read in the speech at Lystra ? " God in times past suffered all nations to walk in their own way. Nevertheless he left not himself without testimony, doing good from heaven, giving rains and fruitful seasons, filling our hearts with food and gladness " (Acts XIV, 15, 17). The Gentiles were therefore in no way destitute of all means of arriving at a knowledge of the true God.

But the author assures us that the " matter is set at rest " by the opposition which follows between the expressions γνόντες τὸν θεὸν (Rom. I, 21) and οὐκ εἰδότες θεὸν (Gal. IV, 8, 9) ; the former must therefore refer to the Jews and the latter to the Galatian Gentiles [1]. As to οὐκ εἰδότες θεόν of Gal. IV, 8, it is to be noted that εἰδότες is a perfect participle denoting an existing state, and hence μὴ εἰδότες means " not possessing knowledge " [2]. How this state of ignorance came about, whether it was partial or absolute, is not here discussed. The ignorance of God the Creator is according to the Epistle to the Romans a culpable ignorance ; it obscures the intelligence so that the heathen fell into idolatry. Hence not knowing God is the cause of their serving them " who by nature are not gods ", — " and they changed the glory of the incorruptible God into the likeness of the image of a corruptible man " (Gal. IV, 8 ; Rom. I, 23).

Shears' theory concerning the total ignorance on the part of the Gentiles and consequently of the non-imputation of guilt in their case on the part of God, is based on Rom. V, 13, and on

1. O. c. p. 17.
2. Cf. BURTON, *The Epistle to the Galatians*, p. 228.

his denial of the natural law. In Rom. v, 13 it is said ἄχρι γὰρ νόμου ἁμαρτία ἦν ἐν κόσμῳ, ἁμαρτία δὲ οὐκ ἐλλογεῖται μὴ ὄντος νόμου [1]. Here again we may remark that while this passage maintains that ἁμαρτία (actual sin) was in the world before the Mosaic Law came into existence, it does not mean that the Gentiles and the Jews, who were then in the same state as the former, had no law at all, and that sin, though not imputed unto death, was not imputed unto guilt. For the Apostle says : " when the Gentiles, who have not the law, do by nature those things that are of the law ; these not having the law (οὗτοι νόμον μὴ ἔχοντες) are a law to themselves " (Rom. II, 14) [2]. Shears, evidently basing his argument on the Pauline usage of ὁ νόμος and νόμος, says : " True he speaks of Gentiles who did by nature the things of the law, and were a law unto themselves, but in the same breath he characterizes them as having no law (νόμον μὴ ἔχοντες), not merely as not having *the* law " [3]. But against this it must be insisted that the Apostle's distinction between ὁ νόμος and νόμος is not absolute, and that he frequently uses νόμος not for law in general, as the author seems to suppose, but for the Mosaic Law which he ordinarily renders by ὁ νόμος. The influence of the context, the peculiar Pauline usages and constructions, and the laws of grammatical sympathy must always be taken into account in exegesis. Thus we have noticed above that in Rom v, 13 where there is certainly question of the Mosaic Law, νόμος is used without the article (cf. also Rom. II, 17, 27). Moreover the Apostle expressly says that the Gentiles show written in their hearts τὸ ἔργον τοῦ νόμου, i. e. the work, the course of conduct, belonging to the Mosaic Law (Rom. II, 15) [4].

1. O. c. p. 13.

2. Denney, *The Theology of the Epistle to the Romans*, II. *The Doctrine of Sin*, Exp. 1901, p. 178, a propos of Rom. II, 14 says : " The only possible explanation of this is that the law must have some other mode of being besides that with which the Jew was familiar. It must be written elsewhere as well as on the tables of stone or the parchment of the scribes. It must speak from other shrines as well as from the ark or from the cloud of Sinai. It must, in a word, belong to Nature as well as to history ; it must be universal as well as national ".

3. Ibid., p. 8.

4. Bovon, *Théologie du Nouveau Testament*, vol. II, p. 136, says : " Ce que les païens trouvent en eux, ce n'est pas, dit Paul, le commandement abstrait, mais bien " l'œuvre de la loi " ou la mise en pratique du précepte, l'application qu'il faut en faire aux circonstances de chaque jour ".

Hence it is not strange that Shears is obliged to find in Saint Paul's writings various inconsistencies " both of expression and of thought ", " a wrong application of a clearly grasped distinction ", and a drawing of " his lines too sharply " [1], suppositions which rather show that the author himself starts out with wrong premisses, and that, in attempting to interpret the Apostle's mind according to them, is led to distort and explain away the natural meaning of the text and context [2]. Moreover, the theory of Shears is in open contradiction to the Pauline teaching concerning the universality of the Redemption (cf. Rom. III, 23 and III, 25 ; II Cor. V, 19).

In conclusion we may add that though in Rom. I, 18-32, Saint Paul so indignantly stigmatizes the wickedness and unnatural deformity of paganism, it is clear from other contexts that his condemnation of heathenism did not make him shut his eyes to the generous and noble side of the Gentile character [3]. In the next chapter he distinctly contemplates the case of Gentiles who, being without law, are a law unto themselves (II, 14, 15). He plainly admits that the uncircumcision which is by nature will put to shame the Jew with all his privileges and advantages (II, 26-29). The Apostle did not consider the pagan world wholly bad ; he recognized with sympathy its scattered and broken lights. But there can be little doubt likewise that the moral condition of pagan civilization was such as abundantly to prove the Apostle's proposition that the heathen fell short of and contradicted their respective standard of δικαιοσύνη.

---

1. O. c., pp. 14, 30, 31.

2. Shears' theory is contrary to that of the majority of Protestant theologians ; cf. Bovon, o. c. vol. II, p. 134 ff., Feine, *Theologie des Neuen Testaments*[3], p. 256 ff., Weiss J., *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments*[2], vol. II, p. 227 ff., Sanday and Headlam, *The Epistle to the Romans* [5], pp. 49-50, Weiss, B., *Biblical Theology* (E. T.), vol. I, pp. 351-356.

3. Bovon, o. c., vol. II, p. 201, writes : " Si Paul fournit deux caractéristiques si différentes, c'est que l'opposition ressortait des faits eux-mêmes : mélange de bien et de mal, — comme les choses humaines, — le paganisme atteste à la fois nos bescins impérissables et la triste dégradation de notre état naturel ".

Art. III. — THE CAUSES OF SIN.

I. THE PSYCHOLOGICAL CAUSE, THE SIN-PRINCIPLE.

Saint Paul, as we have seen above, is firmly convinced of the universality of sin. But a phenomenon so universal in extent and so intense in its force demands a general cause. Saint Paul maintains indeed the liberty of man in sin (Rom. II, 12-16, XIV, 10 ; II Cor. V, 10), but neither human liberty nor any other circumstance of the individual order can account for this universal sinfulness. The general cause which in the judgment of the Apostle explains the origin of different sinful acts is the domination and the indwelling in each and every one of us of the power of sin, ἡ ἁμαρτία. The sin which manifests itself in individual acts is a power, a principle which confronts man, which the Apostle virtually personifies although it does not possess for him objective existence in *rerum natura*. The personification is half poetic, just as in the case of the Law, of death, and of the flesh, but its meaning is a terrible reality : there is a system of sin to which all are enslaved. This power of sin, ἡ ἁμαρτία, Sin, is viewed by Saint Paul under two different aspects : in Rom. V, 12, 21, VIII, 10, ἡ ἁμαρτία denotes principally original sin by which the descendants of Adam are infected by their very origin, while in Rom. VI, 1 ; VIII, 3[b] ἡ ἁμαρτία is chiefly regarded as a sin-principle, concupiscence, by which man is instigated to sin [1]. It is the

1. In order to bring out more clearly the nature of ἡ ἁμαρτία, we deem it useful to quote the definitions given by several Scripture scholars ; Zorell, o. c. p. 32, says : « (ἡ) ἁμαρτία est *quaedam quasi potentia in omnibus singulisque hominibus dominans ;* est fere a) 1. q. *peccatum originale,* quo Adae posteri per ipsam suam originem infecti sunt, b) saepe vero... peccatum originale ita dicitur, ut fere unice consideretur ejus pars materialis, quae etiam remisso ceteroquin per justificationem peccato originali in homine remanet, nempe *concupiscentia, qua homo ad peccandum instigatur ;* » so too Tobac, *Le problème de la justification dans saint Paul,* p. 43, says : « Ce péché qu'Adam a introduit dans le monde, ce n'est pas son acte personnel coupable qu'il aurait communiqué à toute sa postérité ; ce n'est pas l'acte du péché, ni le total des péchés individuels considérés dans leur unité, ni la somme des transgressions qui ne seraient l'œuvre du premier homme que par ce qu'il a été le premier pécheur en date et qu'il a donné l'exemple de la désobéissance. C'est quelque chose d'antérieur à ces transgressions positives et de plus spécial ; c'est cette puissance même de péché personnifiée par S. Paul, représentée comme un roi faisant son entrée dans son pays et établissant sa domination sur ses

latter aspect with which we are concerned at present [1].

This sin-principle is personified by Saint Paul, and is represented as being dead and as coming to life : " Without the law sin was dead... but when the commandment came, sin revived, and I died " (Rom VII, 8-10). It is considered as a despot to whom the sinner is in servile bondage : the Apostle tells the Romans that, though formerly " servants of sin " (Rom. VI, 17, 20), now, having died to sin and risen with Christ in baptism, we must " serve sin no longer " (Rom. VI, 6), we must not allow " sin to reign over our mortal body so as to obey the lusts thereof " (Rom. VI, 12), or " yield our members as instruments of iniquity unto sin " (Rom. VI, 13), that henceforth " sin shall not have dominion over us because we are not under law but under grace " (Rom. VI, 14). The Law is the active instrument whereby Sin works upon man and becomes fatal to him (Rom. V, 20 ; VII, 8, 11 ; I Cor. XV, 56). Again, Sin is regarded as the source of a law by which the sinner is kept in servitude : " But I see another law in my members, fighting against the law of my mind, and captivating me in the law of sin, that is in my members " (Rom. VII, 23). The body is subject to the dominion of concupiscence and obedient to its commands (Rom. VI, 6 : τὸ σῶμα τῆς ἁμαρτίας) ; human nature is said to be a σάρξ ἁμαρτίας in so far as it is infected with Sin (Rom. VIII, 3).

The seat of this sin-principle or concupiscence, to which, according to Saint Paul, we are subject as to a law (Rom. VII, 23, 25 ; VIII, 2), and which proves its existence and efficacy by a multitude of external acts, is in our members, or in our flesh : " For I know that there dwelleth not in me, that is to say, in my flesh, that which is good " (Rom. VII, 18)," but I see another law in my members, fighting against the law of my mind, and captivating me in the law of sin, that is in my members "

---

sujets ; c'est ce tyran péché qui, ainsi qu'il nous est dit ailleurs, a établi son siège dans notre chair et édicte sa loi à nos membres ; » similarly cf. also LAGRANGE, *Épître aux Romains*, p. 105, and PRAT o. c., vol. I[9], p. 252, BENZ, *Die Ethik des Apostels Paulus*, BS, 1912, pp. 11-14.

1. For the sake of clearness it might be noted that in all those texts where there is question of our deliverance from sin by Christ, or where there is question of Christ's immunity from sin, ἁμαρτία is used in a general sense to denote both original and actual sin (cf. I Cor. XV, 3, 17 ; II Cor. V, 21[a] ; Gal. I, 4 ; Col. I, 14). In Rom. VII, 7[a], 13b, ἁμαρτια = sin in general.

(Rom. VII, 23), so that " I myself with the mind serve the law of God, but with the flesh the law of sin " (Rom. VII, 25). Hence we are led to inquire what is the relation of this sin-principle to the flesh ? Is it a natural one, or is it historical ? In order to arrive at accurate notions in this regard we deem it useful to study somewhat in detail the concepts of Pauline psychology. Strictly speaking, however, Saint Paul did not construct a system of psychology. He employs the current vocabulary, and makes use of those words which best convey his thoughts. Though his psychological ideas and his conception of man were fundamentally Biblical, his language enriched and modified itself with time and according to the surroundings in which he laboured [1].

A. *The Pauline Conceptions of* Σάρξ *and* Σῶμα.

In Greek literature σάρξ bears the meaning of " flesh ", but is sometimes used by metonymy to denote the whole body. In the LXX it translates the Hebrew בָּשָׂר, from which it takes over certain other derived meanings, while in the New Testament further developments of meaning appear. In Rom. XIV, 21 and I Cor. VIII, 13 the word κρέας is used for flesh, and in both cases it applies to the flesh of slaughtered animals eaten as food. In the Pauline Epistles σάρξ is used in a twofold sense : in a natural, morally indifferent sense, and, secondly, in an ethical sense.

(1) In its natural sense σάρξ has a variety of meanings. In its most literal and primary application it denotes the soft muscular parts of a living animal body, whether of men or beasts (I Cor. XV, 39), as distinguished from both the blood (I Cor. XV, 50), and the bones (Eph. V, 30). As the chief constituent of the body, and as that which gives it visible form, σάρξ frequently indicates the whole body (Gal. IV, 13),

1. For an exposition of Pauline psychology cf. PRAT, o. c., vol. II[6], pp. 486-492, ZORELL, o. c. pp. 512-513, 555-556, 466-469, 633-635, 378, DUPERRAY, *Le Christ dans la vie chrétienne d'après saint Paul*[2], pp. 78-86, BENZ, o. c. p. 7 ff., FERRARI, *L'uomo irredento in san Paolo*, pp. 23-77, BURTON, o. c. 486-495, LIETZMANN, *An die Römer*[2], p. 77 ff., HOLTZMANN, *Lehrbuch der neutestamentlichen Theologie*[2], p. 12 ff., KENNEDY, *The Theology of the Epistles*, p. 35 ff.

which it designates not, however, as an organism but with reference to its characteristic material substance (II Cor. XII, 7 ; Rom. II, 28 ; I Cor. V, 5 ; Gal. II, 20 ; III, 3 ; Eph. II, 11 ; Phil. I, 22). By metonymy it sometimes designates the basis or result of natural generation, and is used as a collective term equivalent to " kindred " (Rom. XI, 14), or to denote relationship due to natural origin : thus Saint Paul describes Jesus Christ as " born of the seed of David according to the flesh " (Rom. I, 3), refers to the Jews as " my kinsmen according to the flesh " (Rom. IX, 3), and calls Abraham " our forefather according to the flesh " (Rom. IV, 1 ; cf. Rom. IX, 8 ; I Cor. X, 18 ; Gal. IV, 23, 29 ; Eph. II, 11). Frequently σάρξ is used like σῶμα to designate the lower part of human nature in contrast with the higher part, without any disparagement or depreciation of the corporeal element being thereby intended : thus " flesh " is contrasted or combined with " spirit " (Rom. II, 28, 29 ; I Cor. V, 5), as " body " is with " soul " or " spirit " ; it indicates that man is a unity of matter and spirit, of a lower part which links him to an outer world and a higher part which brings him into relation with God, both of them being essential to the completeness of his personality. Finally, σάρξ is used to denote human nature in general, usually, however, with a suggestion of its frailty and weakness apart from the morally transforming power of the Spirit. The term as thus used includes whatever power and privileges come by heredity, but whatever is thus derived is considered as inadequate to enable man to achieve justice. Thus " flesh " (Phil. III, 4 ; Rom. III, 20 ; I Cor. I, 29 ; Gal. II, 16) and the fuller expression " flesh and blood " (Gal. I, 16 ; Eph. VI, 12) have the force of " mortal man ".

This last acceptation and application of σάρξ would naturally lead us to consider next the ethical sense of σάρξ in Pauline usage. But before doing so we shall briefly consider Saint Paul's use of σῶμα, " body ". The Apostle's usage of σῶμα is twofold : figurative or mystical, which we find in his doctrine concerning the Church (Rom. XII, 5 ; I Cor, XII, 12 ff.), and literal, which occurs in connexion with his doctrine of man. It is with the latter that we are here concerned. When distinguished from σάρξ which applies to the material or substance of the living body, σῶμα designates the body as an organic whole, a union of related parts (I Cor. XII, 12). Σῶμα is organized

matter, while σάρξ is the body less the idea of organism, but, as opposed to κρέας, plus the idea of life. However, σάρξ and σῶμα are often used as practically synonymous [1].

(2) In addition to the foregoing which, as we have said, may be characterized as the natural meaning of " flesh ", we find σάρξ used by Saint Paul in an ethical or theological sense to denote the seat and instrument of Sin in fallen humanity. In this sense σάρξ is the material medium in which Sin works, and is thus opposed to " mind ", the faculty of moral knowledge which accepts the Law of God (Rom. VII, 25), and to the " spirit ", the regenerate nature formed in us by the influence of the Holy Spirit. In a wider sense, σάρξ may be said to designate the whole man as Sin has made him (Col. II, 18 ; Gal. V, 19 ; II Cor. I, 12). As compared to the supernatural and preternatural gifts which according to the designs of God man was to possess, " flesh " denotes fallen man in the natural unregenerate state [2]. But although σάρξ may designate the whole man, it is clear that in the technical sense in which he uses the word, Saint Paul places the " flesh " in a special relation to the material part of the human composite (Rom. VII, 18, 22, 23). The seat of evil, the center of sin, is therefore the body itself ; it is the vehicle of original sin, and the stimulator to actual sin.

In precisely the same way Saint Paul employs the adjective " carnal " in contrast with the term, " spiritual " (Rom. VII, 14 ; I Cor. III, 1). " Carnal " represents the adjectives σάρκινός

1. Thus it is difficult to discover a difference of meaning between the two terms if one compares such expressions as I Cor. V, 3 and Col. II, 5 (ἀπὼν τῷ σώματι παρὼν δὲ τῷ πνεύματι; τῇ σαρκὶ ἄπειμι, ἀλλὰ τῷ πνεύματι σὺν ὑμῖν εἰμι), I Cor. VII, 34 and II Cor. VII, 1 (ἁγία καὶ τῷ σώματι καὶ τῷ πνεύματι; καθαρίσωμεν ἑαυτοὺς ἀπὸ παντὸς μολυσμοῦ σάρκος καὶ πνεύματος), II Cor IV,10 and IV, 11 (ἵνα καὶ ἡ ζωὴ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἐν τῷ σώματι ἡμῶν φανερωθῇ ; ἵνα καὶ ἡ ζωὴ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ φανερωθῇ ἐν τῇ θνητῇ σαρκὶ ἡμῶν) and Eph. V, 28 and V, 29 (ὡς τὰ ἑαυτῶν σώματα ; οὐδεὶς γὰρ ποτε τὴν ἑαυτοῦ σάρκα ἐμίσησεν).

Hence the distinction between " flesh " and " body " as established by such authors as PEAKE, *The Quintessence of Paulinism*, pp. 8, 11, MORGAN, *The Religion and Theology of Paul*, p. 17, and repeated by MACKINTOSH, *Historic Theories of the Atonement*, p. 232, according to which the flesh is irremediably and inherently sinful while the body alone is capable of redemption, has no basis in Saint Paul; besides, the Apostle speaks indifferently of a σῶμα τῆς ἁμαρτιάς (Rom. VI, 6) and a σάρξ ἁμαρτίας (Rom. VIII, 3).

2. In regard to such questions as to how far we are fallen creatures, how far and in what sense fallen human nature is corrupt, and for a clear distinction between nature and grace, cf. BAINVEL, *Nature et surnaturel* [5], pp. 1-30.

and σάρκικος which according to their strict meaning correspond to the Latin *carneus* and *carnalis*, ad to the English " fleshy " and " fleshly ". Σάρκινός, as the more literal and grosser term, properly describes that which is composed of flesh. Σάρκικος has an abstract and ethical application, and denotes the " fleshly ", or what pertains to the flesh. The Apostle at times purposely employs σάρκινός as the stronger expression in order to indicate more emphatically the preponderance of the unspiritual element (I Cor. III, 1),which serves as the instrument of sin (Rom. VII, 14). " Carnal " therefore denotes the sinful element which enters man's nature through the ordinary course of physical generation, whereas " spiritual " designates that element which is given from above ; so that the Apostle's contrast of " carnal " and " spiritual " (Rom. VIII, 5) is equivalent to the contrast he elsewhere makes of " natural " and " spiritual " (I Cor. II, 14) But these ideas will become still clearer when we come to study another group of conceptions in the Pauline psychology.

B. *The Pauline Conceptions of* Πνεῦμα, Ψυχή, *and* Νοῦς.

(1) Σάρξ, " flesh ", as influenced by Sin stands in sharp contrast to πνεῦμα, " spirit ". Psychologically, πνεῦμα (רוּחַ) occurs in the Pauline Epistles in a sense not to be essentially distinguished from ψυχή to designate the principle of thought (I Cor. II, 11, VII, 34 ; I Thess. V, 23 ; II Cor. II, 13 ; VII, 13). But in the Apostle's theology πνεῦμα receives a specific religious meaning that must be carefully distinguished from the psychological one. Saint Paul recognizes an opposition between the flesh and the spirit which is more than the natural contrast between the spirit and the body (Rom. VIII, 1, 13). Just as σάρξ primarily denotes the material part of the human composite as influenced by Sin and, in consequence, as the fruitful source of actual sin, so " spirit ", on the other hand, denotes the human πνεῦμα as energized, impregnated, and endowed with the Holy Spirit, to Whom united it becomes the principle of supernatural acts. Whereas in the Old Testament the Spirit of God is the Creator, Conserver of all things, the Agent of miracles and of prophetic inspiration in the New Testament His sphere widens, and He becomes the Vivifier, Regenerator, and Sanctifier. His presence in us

is more than an interior renewal, it is a metamorphosis, a new creation, the production of a divine nature endowed with new properties (cf. II Cor. v, 17 : εἴ τις ἐν Χριστῷ καινὴ κτίσις ; Gal. vi, 15 : καινὴ κτίσις ; Eph. ii, 15 ; iv, 24 : καινὸς ἄνθρωπος). All that elevates us above our carnal nature, all that places us in a divine atmosphere, all that transforms us into spiritual beings, receives from Saint Paul the general name of " spirit ". Hence, just as σάρξ designates also the whole man as Sin has made him, so too πνεῦμα denotes the whole man as the Spirit has renewed him.

(2) Psychologically considered, πνεῦμα does not differ essentially from the next term we are to consider, namely, " soul ", ψυχή. Ψυχή (נֶפֶשׁ) properly signifies a " vital breath ", but by extension denotes life itself. Saint Paul uses ψυχή in several senses : to denote, as opposed to ζωή, the subject in the distinctness of his existence as an individual (Rom. ii, 3 ; xiii, 1 ; I Cor. xv, 45), to designate the soul itself as distinct from the body (II Cor. i, 23) or as the principle of sensitive life (Thess. v, 23, where πνεῦμα and ψυχή are only modally differentiated). Ψυχή is often associated with πνεῦμα, but usually in such a way as to show that there is no intention of distinguishing between the two so as to imply that man is possessed, as Bovon [1] maintains, of a tripartite nature, body, soul, and spirit. Πνεῦμα is employed to denote spiritual and intellectual life, ψυχή organic and sensitive life, though both proceed from the same substance. Furthermore, the derived adjective ψυχικός and πνευματικός point not to any psychological distinction in the elements of human nature, but to a theological distinction between stages of religious experience. The Apostle had so keen a sense of the difference between the unregenerate and the regenerate condition, and of man's fallen state as affecting his whole nature, that he found it necessary to express the contrast in a way which would make it plain that, though the flesh primarily, the soul also, indirectly, was subject to the dominion of Sin. For in virtue of the intimate union of the human composite, of which the sacred writers had so lively a conviction, there is hardly any action of the body which has not its reaction on the soul. For this reason Saint Paul makes an antithesis between " soul "

1. O. c., vol. II, p. 139.

and " spirit ", and opposes the " spiritual ", πνευματικός, to the " soulish ", ψυχικός (I Cor. II, 14 ; cf. also XV, 44-46, where, however, the pejorative sense of ψυχικός is less accentuated and where rather a gradation is intended). The " soulish " man is merely the natural man, the " spiritual " man is one who is under the influence of the Holy Spirit. This distinction of ψυχή and πνεῦμα developes further the tendencies already noticeable in the later Old Testament usage of נֶפֶשׁ and רוּחַ.

(3) Between the πνεῦμα which is the principle of the supernatural Christian life and the σάρξ, the lower and sinful principle in man's nature, stands νοῦς, the faculty of reflective consciousness and the organ of moral thinking and knowing. To illustrate and to enable us to appreciate the distinctive meaning which Saint Paul attaches to " mind ", νοῦς, it is important to study it in the two contrasts in which he sets it, in the one case with σάρξ and in the other with πνεῦμα. In Rom. VII, 23, 25 he contrasts the mind with the flesh, and the law of his mind, which is the law of God, with the law in his members, which is the law of sin ; here plainly νοῦς is the organ of moral knowledge by which he recognizes the will of God as his own. In I Cor. XIV, 14, 15, 19, where νοῦς is contrasted with πνεῦμα, the antithesis is between man's natural faculty of conscious, reflexive knowledge, i. e. the understanding, and that higher principle of the Christian life which is divinely bestowed. The νοῦς can be either dragged down by the flesh or elevated by the spirit ; just as when perverted and enthralled by the flesh it becomes a " fleshly mind " (Col. II, 18), a reprobate mind (Rom. I, 28), or a corrupt mind (I Tim. VI, 5 ; II Tim. III, 8), so also it can be informed and renewed by the spirit until it becomes " a mind of the spirit " (Rom. XII, 2 ; Eph. IV, 23).

In their natural sense we have found σάρξ to denote primarily animated matter, while σῶμα, which is psychologically synonymous with σάρξ, bears the idea of organism, of organized matter. In its ethical sense, however, σάρξ designates flesh as the material medium and vehicle of Sin, and, more generally, the entire man as influenced by Sin. Furthermore, we have seen that πνεῦμα and ψυχή both designate, as the result of a similar and parallel evolution, the principle of life and thought. But in their doctrinal sense

πνεῦμα comes to designate in the Epistles of Saint Paul the principle of the regenerate life, while the derivate adjective of ψυχή, ψυχικός, designates the natural man guided by his natural instincts. Between πνεῦμα and σάρξ stands νοῦς, subject alike to the elevating influence of the former, and the degrading effects of the latter.

C. *The Flesh and the Sin-Principle.*

Having described the various concepts of the Pauline psychology, we are now in a better position to understand the Apostle's description of the natural man under the dominion of Sin. According to Saint Paul, Sin, an alien power, uses the flesh as its vehicle and through its lusts and concupiscences is always actively operative. In fact, the flesh is a " flesh of sin " (σάρξ ἁμαρτίας, Rom. VIII, 3), whence proceed all evil works. The body too is a " body of sin " (σῶμα τῆς ἁμαρτίας, Rom. VI, 6), in which mortal body Sin is reigning (Rom. VI, 12). The flesh has its lusts and concupiscences (ἐπιθυμία σάρκος, Gal. V, 16, 17, 24 ; Rom. XIII, 14) ; " the wisdom of the flesh ", (τὸ φρόνημα τῆς σάρκος), leads to death (Rom. VIII, 6, 7) ; we conversed in times past in the desires of the flesh, fulfilling the will of the flesh (τὰ θελήματα τῆς σάρκος, Eph. II, 3). For " they that are according to the flesh, mind the things that are of the flesh " (Rom. VIII, 5), and " when we were in the flesh, the passions of sin (τὰ παθήματα τῶν ἁμαρτίων) which were by the law did work in our members to bring forth fruit unto death " (Rom. VII, 5) [1].

In Gal. V, 19-23 the Apostle enumerates the works of the flesh (τὰ ἔργα τῆς σάρκος), and sets them in contrast with the fruit of the Spirit (ὁ καρπὸς τοῦ πνεύματος). Among the former are found not only sensuous sins, such as unchastity and drunkenness, but such also which pertain rather to the intellectual order, as εἰδωλολατρεία, φαρμακεία, ἔχθραι, ἔρις, ζῆλος, θυμοί, ἐριθεῖαι, διχοστασίαι, αἱρέσεις, φθόνοι. Similarly in Rom. XIII, 13, 14, the avoidance of making provision for the flesh (τῆς σάρκος πρόνοια) includes the renunciation not only of

1. Cf. KENNEDY, o. c., p. 33 ff., TERRY, *Biblical Dogmatics*, p. 114 ff., MACKINTOSH, art. *The Roots of St. Paul's Doctrine of Sin*, Exp. 1913, 8 Ser., p. 452 ff.

chambering and wantonness but also of jealousy and strife (ἔρις, ζῆλος). In addressing the Corinthians the Apostle designates them as " carnal " (σαρκικοί), because there is among them jealousy and strife (I Cor. III, 3). Moreover, in II Cor. I, 12 he speaks of a σοφία σαρκική, i. e., a worldly and selfish policy as opposed to the holiness and sincerity of God, and in Col. II, 18 of " a sense of the flesh " (ὑπὸ τοῦ νοὸς τῆς σάρκος αὐτῶν). The Apostle nowhere explains how and in what sense and manner these sins are caused by the flesh. It is probable that he regarded them not as immediate acts of the inferior carnal man, but rather as deeds of the natural man influenced by Sin [1]. Furthermore, Saint Paul establishes a close relation between a selfish, egoistic life, and life according to the flesh. The flesh is the necessary intermediary in all of man's relations with the sensible world, and by it one enters into contact with inferior, earthly things. But the pursuit of these diverts man from seeking higher things, and hence instead of living for God he lives for himself, and from this egoism arise the sins enumerated above (cf. Gal. V, 13, 14 ; I Cor. XIII, 5 ; Rom. VIII, 4, 9, 12 ; XIV, 7 ; II Cor. V, 15) [2].

The relation which the Apostle establishes between the flesh and sin is, as we noted above, a very close one (Rom. VII, 18, 23, 25). The Apostle says that he is " carnal, sold under sin " (Rom. VII, 14, ἐγὼ δὲ σάρκινός εἰμι, πεπραμένος ὑπὸ τὴν ἁμαρτίαν). Man is not only driven by the concupiscences of his flesh to accomplish all kinds of evil acts but he is, as it were, enslaved to Sin. One is therefore naturally led to inquire, what relation did the Apostle conceive as existing between the flesh and sin ? According to the view maintained by Peake and repeated by Mackintosh, the " flesh " in the Pauline Epistles is represented as essentially sinful. Says the former : " The flesh is evil through and through. It is so irretrievably the slave and instrument of sin, it is entrenched in such abiding hostility to God and His will, that no redemption or even improvement of it is possible " [3] ; so too Mackintosh : " according to Saint Paul human flesh as such is inherently sinful, and the fall of Adam is not the origin but the first manifestation of the evil

1. Cf. LAGRANGE, *Épître aux Galates*, p. 149.
2. Cf. JUNCKER, *Die Ethik des Apostels Paulus*, p. 49.
3. O. c., pp. 8, 11.

principle of humanity " [1]. But if this theory be true how could the Apostle exhort his readers to cleanse themselves " from all defilement of the flesh (ἀπὸ παντὸς μολυσμοῦ σαρκός, II Cor. VII, 1) ? If the body is irremediably impure, how can it be " for the Lord " (I Cor. VI, 13), how can it be the temple of the Holy Ghost (I Cor. VI, 19), how can it be an " instrument of justice unto God " (Rom. VI, 13), and be offered " a living sacrifice, holy, pleasing unto God " (Rom. XII, 1). Saint Paul in these passages certainly does not consider σῶμα as merely a formal element, as a pure form, but as the carnal organism. Again, if Saint Paul considered the principle of sin as necessarily lying in man's corporeal nature, how could he speak of the sinlessness (II Cor. V, 21) of One born of a woman (Gal. IV, 4)? To say that the matter of the body is the very principle of sin, and then to say as the Apostle does in Rom. VIII, 11 : " and if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Jesus Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies, because of his spirit that dwelleth in you ", would be flat self-contradiction. Indeed, how could the Apostle have given so high and constant a place in his doctrine of the future life to the hope of Resurrection, if he had conceived of the body as the *fons and origo* of evil in man. He would rather have been driven to long for its utter dissolution, and to center his hope for the eternal future in a bare doctrine of the immortality of the soul ; Redemption itself ought to culminate in man's deliverance from the body [2].

Other theologians as Holtzmann [3] and Morgan while they do not establish an absolute identity between sin and the flesh, maintain nevertheless that there is a necessary connection between the two. Thus Morgan writes : " The tyranny of the flesh is the all-determining fact... the soul is bound to evil

1. O. c., p. 232.

2. The theory of the inherent sinfulness of the flesh is rejected to-day by the majority of Protestant theologians ; thus e. g. DENNEY, *The Christian Doctrine of Reconciliation*, p. 198, writes : " Our whole nature is involved in sin, but not indistinguishably and irretrievably involved, and we disown the sin and protest against it even when we feel ourselves most hopelessly its slaves " ; cf. also, BERNARD, art. *Sin*, HDB, vol. IV. p. 535, GARVIE, o. c., p. 141, JUNCKER, o. c., p. 42 ff., CLEMEN, *Die Lehre von der Sünde*, p. 61 ff.

3. O. c., p. 24 : " Im physischen Fleischsein liegt der ausreichende und unvermeidlich wirksame Grund seines moralischen Fleischseins ".

it can never of itself break... the natural man is carnal... his bondage is absolute... only by a divine act of redemption can the soul be delivered ; and it is the proper subject of the redeeming process... the flesh is not redeemed but destroyed... Paul leaves no place for the freedom of the will " [1]. This theory is disproved by the arguments which we have already adduced above. Besides, if this connection were so necessary, how could even the Christian himself as long as he lives in the flesh triumph over sin ? Sin would necessarily flow from the flesh in spite of the action of the πνεῦμα. Notwithstanding the fatal domination of sin over man, Saint Paul preserves human liberty and responsibility ; sin is man's voluntary and guilty act, and the responsibility belongs to him who commits it. The Apostle's most extended portrayal of the development of sin in history is found in his arraignment of the Gentile and Jewish worlds in Rom. I and II, and throughout this passage the guilt of sin is charged to the evil choices of men. The Gentiles wilfully sinned against the light which God had given them, and hence can plead no palliation or excuse (I, 18, 20). The action of God in plunging them into deeper depths of sin (I, 24, 26) was but the infliction of the judicial consequences of their action. It was because they refused to have God in their knowledge that God gave them up to a reprobate mind (I, 28). And the same charge of guilt for evil choices and inexcusable deeds is imputed to the Jews. The Apostle accuses the Jews of practising the same things as the Gentiles (II, 2, 3), of contempt for God's goodness, of hardness and impenitence of heart, of such crimes as theft, robbery of temples, adultery, and blasphemy (II, 4, 5, 21, 24), — sins of choice for which they cannot escape the just judgment of God (II, 6). Saint Paul is therefore convinced that Sin does not exercise this domination over man until after having previously seduced him (Rom. VII, 11), and overcome the resistance of his " interior man " (Rom. VII, 19, 22).

Other theologians, arguing from the fact that Saint Paul includes under works of the flesh sins not only of the sensual but also of the intellectual order, that in his Epistles " you are men " and " you are carnal " are sometimes synonymous, and that " flesh " often designates animated matter, maintain that

1. O. c., pp. 17, 19.

Saint Paul, when employing σάρξ in the ethical sense, wishes simply to denote man in so far as he is a creature opposed to God and that he makes complete abstraction of all connections between sin and the material part of man. If sin is therefore dwelling in the flesh this means nothing more than that man because of his native imperfection has the occasion and power to oppose his will to God. According to Garvie " *flesh* is a compendious term for the nature of man as a creature " [1], and according to B. Weiss, " If, now, according to the Pauline view, sin dwells in the σάρξ, this can only mean that the idiosyncrasy of the human nature, which is the consequence of man's natural basis, has become, and becomes an occasion to him to assert this individuality of his in opposition to the divine will, and so to determine himself in a manner contrary to God. This has happened first of all in the transgression of Adam " [2]. A similar view is upheld by Wendt [3]. This theory, however, is wholly unacceptable. For, according to these theologians, Adam would have been as carnal as his descendants ; furthermore, the angels too would be carnal like men, and neither could ever cease to be carnal because they are both essentially created beings. Besides, this theory attributes to Saint Paul a confusion between moral and metaphysical evil, between the privation of a good, which in the designs of God rational nature was to possess, and the absence of a perfection resulting from the essential limitation of all finite beings.

The flesh therefore is neither evil in itself nor essentially, sinful, since it is capable of being purified, sanctified, and glorified ; it is morally indifferent. Nevertheless, it is the source of sensual lusts and egoistic concupiscences which place it in constant antagonism to the essential good of rational nature ; these appetites are not yet sin, but the man who allows himself to be led and dominated by them becomes a sinner. In this conflict the mind left to itself is overcome and becomes carnal, unless it has the assistance of the πνεῦμα.

At this point it might be asked : is this sin-principle, this concupiscence which dwells in the flesh and which exteriorizes itself by countless sinful acts, something natural to man or something historically introduced into the human race ?

1. O. c., pp. 141-142.
2. *Biblical Theology of the New Testament* (E. T.), p. 344.
3. *System der christliche Lehre*[2], pp. 254-255.

Ritschl [1] in treating of Rom. VII, 7, 11, claims that Saint Paul considered this *sündiger Hang* as something acquired. Certain others as Pfleiderer [2], Juncker [3], and Dibelius [4], go to the other extreme and see in ἡ ἁμαρτία a personal spiritual being, a demon. Consistently with his evolutionist principles, Woods regards our slavery to ἡ ἁμαρτία as a state of sin in which all men are included by reason of their birth into the specific limitations of a flesh nature ; this condition is a " state of miss, failure, non-attainment " [5] ; sin in this sense is the connotation of limitation, which is but a synonym for human nature at the " pole of the Old Man ", and positively inevitable to the evolving race ; " Sin " says the author [6], " according to the sense of St. Paul in such passages as Romans VI, 10, 11 ; VI, 2 ; VIII, 2 ; III, 23 ; is the limitation laid upon the individual spirit which makes him for the time being a little lower than Divine. In this sense there is no opprobrium in the term ; a sinner may be well on the road to the mark, but the fact that he has not yet attained it keeps him a sinner still ". We shall again return, later on, to these vagaries and aberrations of the so-called " New Theology ". Suffice it to note here that we have already indicated the answer to this question above : this concupiscence or sin-principle, which dwells in the flesh and stimulates and instigates man to commit actual sin, is only an aspect under which the Apostle views that power of sin, ἡ ἁμαρτία, historically introduced into humanity by the transgression of Adam. It is to a consideration of this latter question that we now turn.

---

1. O. c., vol. III [4], pp. 330-331 : " Denn der sündige Hang, welchen er in sich als vorhanden entdeckt hat, indem das Verbot ihn zu ersten bewuszten Thatsünde gereizt hat (Rom. VII, 7, 11), wird von ihn selbst nicht als angeerbt bezeichnet, und kann mit Fug und Recht als etwas Erworbenes verstanden werden " ; cf. also vol. II [4], p. 242.

2. *Das Urchristentum* [2], vol. I, p. 197, Sin= " ein dämonisches Geistwesen ".

3. O. c., p. 98, Sin= " eine selbstlebendige Macht und ein persönliches Wesen ".

4. *Die Geisterwelt im Glauben des Paulus*, p. 122 : " Die Sünde wird also im Rm. VI und VII als persönliche Macht vorgestellt. ... Die Sünde hat ihren Sitz im Menschen ; eine Analogie bietet de " Besessenheit ", wie sie z. B. in dem Evangelien geschildert wird. So werden wir die Sünde bezeichnen können als einen Dämon, der in den Menschen hineinfährt ". Cf. also GARVIE, art. *Sin*, DAC, vol. II, p. 498 ff.

5. *Gospel of Rightness*, p. 98.

6. O. c., p. 101.

II. THE HISTORICAL CAUSE OF SIN: THE TRANSGRESSION OF ADAM.

Saint Paul testifies that sin entered our race in and through the disobedience of Adam (Rom. v, 12, 18, 19)[1]. In the parallelism of Rom. v, 12-21, the Apostle is seeking to show the excellence of grace and the transcendent blessedness of man's life in Christ by the analogies which they present with his fall and death in Adam, the historic head of the race. The correspondence of the fall to the Redemptive work of Jesus Christ in respect to the influence of each was such that he needs must develop it in its fulness of meaning, and thus exalt Christ as the revelation of God's wisdom, power, and love. It is to be remarked that it is not the primary purpose of the Apostle in Rom. v, 12, 19 to discuss the origin and entrance of sin into the human race, a fact, which he presupposes as known to his readers; this, however, does not depreciate his testimony, which, because it is incidental and not studied, is all the more convincing and trustworthy. The main point emphasized by the Apostle in this section is the unity of authors: one is the author of justice and life as one is the author of sin and death.

The intimate connection which exists in the Pauline Epistles between original sin and the Redemption, between the primitive economy and its restoration by the soteriological work of Christ, cannot be over-emphasized. Many modern Protestant theologians as Ritschl [2], Denney [3], Peake [4],

1. We do not deem it necessary to repeat here the Jewish views of the Fall and of original sin. For this question the reader may consult, LAGRANGE, *Épître aux Romains*, pp. 113-118, SANDAY and HEADLAM, *The Epistle to the Romans* [5], pp. 136-138, THACKERAY, *The Relation of Paul to Contemporary Jewish Thought*, pp. 29-57.

2. O. c., vol. III [4], p. 358: " Denn auch nur durch die Summirung aller Erfahrungen erreichen wir die Ueberzeugung von dem allgemeinen Walten der Sünde. Damit darf sich auch die Theologie zufrieden geben ".

3. *The Christian Doctrine of Reconciliation*, p. 216, maintains that the need of redemption and reconciliation is created independently of " any questions about Adam and his fall; that moral evil is present in the race, that it is diffused through all its members, that there is a divine reaction against it, ceaseless and uncompromising, are facts independant of our knowledge and ignorance of the first man ".

4. O. c., p. 24, says that Saint Paul does not think of man's moral nature as damaged by the act of Adam, nor does he suppose that the moral status of humanity is fixed by what was nothing more than the act of an irresponsible individual.

Shears [1], Forsyth [2], and Garvie [3], who do not distinguish the supernatural from the natural order, maintain that the Atonement is independent of the doctrine of original sin, and that the whole reality of sin and of the Redemption is to be sought in "religious experience" and in the individual conscience. But no such theory can be harmonized with the teaching of Saint Paul: just as Adam by his transgression introduced into humanity sin and, what in Scriptural use is a compendious term for all the penalties and consequences of sin, namely, death, a state of things which therefore did not exist before his fall, so also Jesus Christ procured for all men justice and life. In particular, the work of Christ is called a καταλλαγή, a reconciliation (Rom. v, 11 ; II Cor. v, 18, 19 ; Col. i, 20), an ἀπολύτρωσις, a redemption from servitude to sin unto the pristine liberty (Rom. iii, 24 ; I Cor. i, 30 ; Eph. i, 7), a καινὴ κτίσις, a new creation and renovation (II Cor. v, 17, iv, 16 ; Eph. iv, 23), a παλιγγενεσία, a regeneration (Tit. iii, 5), an υἱοθεσία, a restoration to sonship (Gal. iv, 5), and an ἀνακεφαλαίωσις, a recapitulation by which all things are restored to their primitive harmony (Eph. i, 10). This new condition which we owe to Christ is one of grace and sonship whereby we become the children of God and heirs of heaven. But this new state is not only an elevation but also a restoration, not only peace but also a renewal of the first

1. O. c., p. 8, leaves out Adam's sin as "an obviously unessential part of the scheme", and then tries to harmonize Saint Paul's teaching with that of modern evolution.

2. *The Atonement in Modern Religious Thought*, p. 63. We shall again return to the above views when we come to discuss the psychological theory of the origin of sin.

3. O. c., p. 144, says : "The Gospel of Paul does not rest on his view of the origin of sin but on his own knowledge of man's double need of deliverance from the guilt and the power of sin". The author maintains that Saint Paul's explanation of the origin of sin is not an interpretation of "universal and permanent realities" (p. 144), and concludes : "let us frankly admit that his view of the origin of sin leaves the problem for us unsolved" (p. 146). Yet strange to say he later continues : "Paul represents Adam's sin as the source of the sin of the human race. Without expressly stating it, he assumes the doctrine of original sin in the sense of an inherited tendency to sin, for he does undoubtedly affirm here that both the sin and the death of mankind result from Adam's transgression" (p. 148). And finally in answer to the question whether modern science has disproved Saint Paul's doctrine, the author answers : "Our modern knowledge does not disprove Paul's view" (p. 149). Does then the author, who always desires to improve on the Apostle's teaching, finish by becoming convinced that Saint Paul interpreted more of "universal and permanent realities" than seemed evident to him at first?

alliance, a reconciliation. Hence the work whereby Jesus Christ procured these privileges for us loses its essential *raison d'être* if its basis, the doctrine of Adam's transgression, is removed from the Pauline Epistles.

A. *The Pauline Doctrine of Original Sin in* Rom. v, 12-19.

In a general way it may be said that the doctrine of original sin runs throughout the theology of Saint Paul. This is evident, as we have seen, from the Apostle's teaching concerning the " flesh ", the " soulish " and " carnal " man, the " old man ", from all those texts where he describes the conflict of the unregenerate man under the dominion of Sin, from all those passages where he says that we are born children of wrath, slaves and not heirs, and from his doctrine concerning baptism and regeneration in Jesus Christ. But these passages while they imply and suppose original sin, do not clearly indicate the doctrine. It is therefore to the clear affirmation of Rom. v, 12, 21 ; that we now turn. We shall prove against such authors as Weinel [1], and Hitchcock [2], that in this passage the Apostle teaches the doctrine of original sin, i. e. that by virtue of the solidarity which existed between Adam, the *caput et fons naturae,* and his descendants, we all sinned in Adam when he sinned [3]. In our proof we shall show, first, that in Rom. v, 12 : Διὰ τοῦτο ὥσπερ δι' ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου ἡ ἁμαρτία εἰς τὸν

1. *Biblische Theologie des Neuen Testaments*[3], pp. 273-274 : " In Röm. v, 12, steht nichts von einer Erbsünde... in Röm. v, 16 und 18, steht vielleicht eine Erbschuldlehre... notwendig ist sie nicht ".

2. O. c., p. 11. " The doctrine of the Fall of Man, which played so great a part in theology is not found in the Scriptures of the New Testament ". Diametrically opposed to the above views is that of Rashdall, *The Idea of Atonement,* who says, pp. 86, 87, " Innumerable attempts have been made to get rid of the conceptions of original sin... from St. Paul's teaching. I cannot but think that they all fail.... There is no reason for attempting to explain away the *prima facie* meaning of St. Paul ".

3. For the Pauline doctrine concerning original sin cf. Billot, *De personali et originali peccato* [5], p. 152 ff., Palmieri, *Tractatus de peccato originali,* p. 15 ff., Lepicier, *Tractatus de peccato originali,* p. 15 ff., Prat, o. c., vol. I[9], pp. 253-263, II[6], pp. 66-69, Lemonnyer, *Épitres de saint Paul,* vol. I, pp. 283-285, Le Bachelet, art. *Péché originel,* DApFC, coll. 1735-1755, fasc. xvii, Harent, art. *Original Sin,* CE. vol. XI, pp. 312-315 ; as to such questions as how could Adam sin, cf. Dubois, art. *A propos du péché d'Adam,* RCF, July 1909, pp. 102-104, or, how far our present evil tendencies are a proof of original sin, cf. Riviere, art. *Le péché originel,* RCF, May 1914, pp. 471-473.

κόσμον εἰσῆλθεν καὶ διὰ τῆς ἁμαρτίας ὁ θάνατος, καὶ οὕτως εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους ὁ θάνατος διῆλθεν, ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον [1], there is no question of actual personal sin ; secondly, that there is no question of a sin which men inherited in the sense that all imitated the transgression of Adam, and thirdly that original sin, of which alone there is question in Rom. v, 12-19, has the character of sin really and properly so called.

(1) According to certain theologians such as Fricke [2], and Feine [3], death in Rom. v, 12 is not the effect of original sin but of actual personal sins. For when elsewhere the Apostle says that the Gentiles " who having known the justice of God, did not understand that they who do such things are worthy of death " (Rom. 1, 32), and again that " whosoever have sinned without the law shall perish without the law " (Rom. II, 12), is he not, they urge, always speaking of actual sins of which death is the penalty ? Is it not again of actual sins that the Apostles speaks in Rom. III, 23 : " All have sinned (πάντες γὰρ ἥμαρτον) and do need the glory of God " ? and in the parallel assertion in Rom. v, 12, εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους ὁ θάνατος διῆλθεν ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον, has not the aorist the same sense as in Rom. III, 23, namely, to commit a sin, to violate the law of God ? And does not Saint Paul clearly state that

1. In v, 12 the apodosis to the sentence beginning with ὥσπερ is not completed. Saint Paul loses sight of his originally intended parallel (cf. I Tim. 1, 3) while proving that in Adam πάντες ἥμαρτον, in vv, 13-14. The clause, ὅς ἐστι τύπος τοῦ μέλλοντος, is a first substitute for the true apodosis which would have run thus : οὕτω δι' ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου (Χριστοῦ) δικαιοσύνη καὶ διά τῆς δικαιοσύνης ἡ ζωή κ. τ. λ. ; this is more nearly reached in v. 18. It is also to be noted that many scholars translate the expression, ἐφ' ᾧ, not " in quo ", since this would have been ἐν ᾧ, but as ἐπὶ τούτῳ ὅτι, i. e. " in this that ", " on the ground that ", " because " ; cf. CORNELY, *Epistola ad Romanos*, p. 283, LAGRANGE, *Épître aux Romains*, p. 106, PESCH, *Praelectiones dogmaticae*, vol. III, p. 121, TOUSSAINT. *Épitres de saint Paul*, vol. II, p. 171 ; MOULTON, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*[3], p. 107, translates ἐφ' ᾧ by " in view of the fact that ", BLASS-DEBRUNNER, *Grammatik des neutestamentliches Griechisch*[5], p. 135, by " darum dasz ", " weil ", and ROBERTSON, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament*, p. 604, by ἐπὶ τούτῳ ὅτι. BILLOT, o. c., p. 152 ff., following Bossuet maintains that the Vulgate reading " in quo " is to be retained. Which reading we adopt is, as PESCH, o. c., p. 121 remarks, indifferent to our argument ; in fact, a Protestant theologian, BRUCE, *St. Paul's Conception of Christianity*, p. 130, says : " The rendering of the Vulgate, *in quo omnes peccaverunt*, is grammatically wrong...yet essentially right ".

2. *De mente dogmatica loci paulini ad Rom.* 5, 12 sq., p. 18.

3. *Theologie des neuen Testaments*[3], p. 260.

he himself became subject to death only when Sin seduced him to a consciously sinful act (Rom. VII, 9, 12) ? Hence, according to the above theologians, a sentence of death struck Adam because of his transgression. But this death was not to remain an isolated fact, but the same sentence was to extend itself to all humanity and for all times because all would sin after the manner of Adam i. e., by committing personal guilty acts. Accordingly, Saint Paul represents death as a sentence of condemnation suspended over the whole of humanity because of the transgression of Adam, and reaching all men by means of their actual sins.

According to others as Goguel [1] and Clemen [2], Adam is the cause of our death because he is the cause of our sins. If all die it is because of their actual and personal sins which in turn are due to the fact that we have inherited from Adam a flesh subject to sin. On account of the transgression of Adam, the sin-principle or concupiscence has entered into the world, propagates itself by natural generation, gains control over men from their, birth and continually instigates them to sinful acts. According to this theory, then, Adam can be called the cause of our death because he is the cause of our sins, but unlike the former theory, it does not represent this death as a sentence of condamnation suspended over the race because of the prevarication of Adam and attaining all men through their personal faults. That the above two theories, in spite of their apparent resemblances with the Catholic doctrine, are a wholly insufficient explanation of Rom. V, 12-19, we shall now proceed to show.

(a) The first argument is drawn from the particular usage of ἁμαρτία with the article ; ἡ ἁμαρτία signifies a sin already known to the readers, unique in its kind, which cannot be other than original. For, generally, Greek names of virtues and vices are used without the article ; if the latter, however, is used its purpose in the Greek idiom is to denote a whole genus, or a certain determined individual of the genus which is known either *per se*, because of its special preeminence, or from the context and adjuncts. Now ἡ ἁμαρτία has not a generic force

1. *L'Apôtre Paul et Jésus-Christ*, p. 151 ff.
2. *Die christliche Lehre von der Sünde*, p. 249.

as Denney [1] claims, so as to comprise all the sins of the world. To attribute all these to the first man would be preposterous and more than unjust, especially if transfusion of original guilt is denied Ἡ ἁμαρτία therefore denotes some determined sin, known not from the context or adjuncts but *per se*, because of its preeminence, i. e. original sin transmitted by Adam to his whole posterity.

Again, ἡ ἁμαρτία is distinguished from παράβασις, παράπτωμα, παρακοή, which designate the actual transgression of the law, an actual transitus from the state of justice to that of sin. These terms are used to designate the prevarication of Adam, on account of which many are constituted ἁμαρτωλοί, i. e. on account of which ἡ ἁμαρτία entered the world as its effect, and indwells in each and every one (Rom. v, 19). This ἡ ἁμαρτία is furthermore conceived as a principle or diffusive power which spreads itself abroad. When the Apostle wrote ἡ ἁμαρτία εἰς τὸν κόσμον εἰσῆλθεν he did not refer to the commission of individual or personal sins but to the entrance of sin as a power to which all become subject.

That in πάντες ἥμαρτον the Apostle introduces no new reason or conception different from the above, will become evident from the following consideration ; for the sake of clarity it may be noted that v. 12 consists of four parts, namely,

(1) δι' ἑνός ανθρώπου ἡ ἁμαρτία εἰς τὸν κόσμον εἰσῆλθεν,
(2) καὶ διὰ τῆς ἁμαρτίας ὁ θάνατος,
(3) καὶ οὕτως εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους ὁ θάνατος διῆλθεν,
(4) ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον.

Now in (2) θάνατος is represented as the effect of ἡ ἁμαρτία of (1), while the θάνατος of (3) is said to be the effect of ἥμαρτον. Furthermore, in (4), which is the antecedent of (3), ἥμαρτον is said to be the cause of *all* death. Now if the sin of which there is question in (4) is different from that mentioned in (1) two conclusions would follow : first, it would be false that the sin of (1) is the cause of death ; second, the Apostle's statement, that the reason why the sin of (4) is the cause of death is because through the sin of (1) death had entered, would also be false ; that for Saint Paul one was as true as the other is evident from the expression καὶ οὕτως by which he connects the two parts of the sentence. From the above it immediately follows

1. *The Theology of the Epistle to the Romans*, II. *The Doctrine of Sin*, Exp. 1901, p. 173.

that the κόσμος into which ἡ ἁμαρτία entered is the whole human race, the same subject as that into which death entered. For if by κόσμος Saint Paul understand both the invisible and the visible world, and wished to indicate the first entrance of sin into both, he would have said that sin entered through Satan of whom it is written that " he sinneth from the beginning " (I John III, 8), and if he meant only the latter he would not have said " by one man " but " by one woman ", since Eve sinned before Adam (I Tim. II, 14).

The Apostle affirms, as we have seen, that both death and ἡ ἁμαρτία entered the κόσμος, i. e. the whole of humanity. Now just as all men become subject to the sway of death, so also all men become subject to the power of Sin, since, according to Saint Paul, both death and Sin entered the human race in the same way. That ἡ ἁμαρτία denotes original sin is evident finally from the following : firstly, the reason why εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους ὁ θάνατος διῆλθεν was because πάντες ἥμαρτον; but if ἥμαρτον denotes actual sins the argument breaks down, since among the universality of men who die are included countless numbers who never commit actual sins ; secondly, as the justice of Christ by which men are constituted just is inherent so also the Sin by which all are constituted sinners is inherent.

(b) Another proof that in Rom. V, 12-19, there is no question of actual sin may be thus stated : the special reason why the Apostle insists on the universality of sin and death as connected with Adam's transgression is to magnify the universal destination of the grace which God provides for us in Christ. Just as no allusion is made to the personal acts by which believers appropriate the justice of God, so no reference is made to personal acts by which individuals become sinners. The main point of the Apostle is that just as one is the source and cause of justice and life : " by the grace of *one* man, Jesus Christ, the grace of God and the gift hath abounded much more unto many " (v. 15), " through *one*, Jesus Christ, they who receive abundance of grace, and of the gift, and of justice, shall reign in life " (v. 17), " by the justice of *one*, unto all men to justification of life " (v. 18), " by the obedience of *one*, many shall be made just ,, (v. 19), so also one is the source and author of sin and death : " by *one* man sin entered into this world, and by sin death " (v. 12), " by the offence of *one* many died " (v. 15),

" judgment was by *one* unto condemnation " (v. 16), " by *one* man's offence *death* reigned through *one* " (διὰ τοῦ ἑνός) (v. 17), " by the offence of *one*, unto all men to condemnation " (v. 18), " by the disobedience of *one* man, many were made sinners " (v. 19). Hence any attempt to introduce concrete and personal acts of individuals into the passages dealing with the relation of sin and death to Adam's transgression, is to distort the fundamental view point of the Apostle, and to destroy the consistency and harmony of the two members of the parallelism.

(c) Another argument is to be derived from the use of the aorist tense, ἥμαρτον, though we recognize that it is easy to exaggerate the force of the tense considered in itself. The counterpart of the identification of unregenerate humanity with Adam is to be found in the mystical identification with Christ in His redeeming work. It is only when the term ἥμαρτον is compared with the use of the aorist in these passages to denote acts of individuals, conceived of as contemporaneous with and included in the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ, that the full force of this reason appears (cf. οἱ πάντες ἀπέθανον, II Cor. v, 14 ; ἀπεθάνετε, Col. III, 3 ; ἀπεθάνετε, Col. II, 20 ; ἀπεθάνομεν, Rom. v, 8 ; ἥμαρτον, Rom. v, 12). Just as these texts can be naturally explained only by referring the " dying " back to the time of Christ's death, so also in Rom. v, 12, which is the logical counterpart of the above representations, it is most natural to refer the aorist ἥμαρτον back to the act of Adam with which the sinning of all is identified. Of this law of solidarity which underlies the above argument more will be said later on.

(d) Again, if Saint Paul is speaking of personal sins, the reason which he gives for the absolutely universal prevalence of death, namely πάντες ἥμαρτον, would not be true. For the term πάντες in the expression πάντες ἥμαρτον, the antecedent of the Apostle's argument, must be coextensive with the πάντας of the previous clause, the consequent, else πάντες ἥμαρτον would give no valid reason for εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους ὁ θάνατος διῆλθεν. But it is not coextensive if πάντες ἥμαρτον means " personally sinned " and the argument breaks down. For children also are subject to death and often die before the age of reason, i. e. before they could have done any good or evil by an act of their will (Rom. IX, 11). If the Apostle " really

meant to say that all died because all personally sinned, he must have forgotten the very large number of human beings who die in infancy, an act of forgetfulness very unlikely in so humane a man and so considerate a theologian " [1]. We are not unconscious of the opposition which this explanation provokes among certain other theologians. However the fact remains that Saint Paul is here speaking of a universal experience, and who can prove that he did not think of or excluded from his most general observation so common a fact as the death of infants. In fact, in Rom. c. VII, where the Apostle is describing the psychological experiences of a Jewish boy before the age of reason, i. e. before the instruction in the principles of the Law, he tells us that he was already at that time under the control of ἡ ἁμαρτία but that this latter was dead, inactive. But when the Law came Sin found a *point d'appni* and led him to actual sin. If consequently the Jewish boy, i. e. infants, dies before the age of reason and before committing actual sin, is not this precisely because of the fact that he inherited from Adam the Sin, ἡ ἁμαρτία, by which all are constituted sinners (Rom. VII, 7, 11 ; V, 19, 12) ?

(e) Finally, some, arguing from the Pauline usage of οἱ πολλοί (Rom. V, 15, 19), maintain that the πάντες of Rom. V, 12, is to be understood only of adults, and consequently of personal sins. To this objection we would make the following answer : firstly, in Rom. V, 12, 15, 18, 19 πάντες and πολλοί are used indiscriminately, and hence the extension of πολλοί in vv. 15 and 19 is to be the same as that of πάντες in vv. 12 and 18 ; but the word πάντες, as we have seen above in v. 12, denotes absolutely all men and not merely many ; secondly, when πολλοί is used with the article and is opposed to τῷ ἑνί, its meaning is " all the rest of men " [2]: the Apostle says οἱ πολλοί not in comparison with the universality of men as if they were " many " from among them, but in comparison with *one* by whom they were constituted sinners or just. As said above, we must always remember the fundamental viewpoint of Saint Paul in Rom. V, 12, 19 : the Apostle is not instituting an antithesis between the number of those damned in Adam and those regenerated in Christ, but between the harm caused to the rest of humanity by the offence of the one man,

1. BRUCE, *St. Paul's Conception of Christianity*, p. 131.
2. Cf. GRIMM, *Lexicon Graeco-Latinum in libros Novi Testamenti* [4], p. 369.

Adam, and the blessings brought about by the merits of the one man, Jesus Christ.

(2) The arguments given above are also sufficient to disprove a kindred theory according to which πάντες ἥμαρτον refers to a sin which passed on all men by imitation, i. e. in so far as they imitate the transgression of Adam. According to this theory how can death be said to have reigned over all men, since the transgression of Adam is known and understood by only a small part of humanity, and often exercises no seduction or force at all ? Again, when the Apostle says with so much emphasis that by one man sin entered into this world, he surely wished to say something of solemn importance. He wished to mention an offence whose influence was of the greatest consequence to the race, a disobedience whose results in the order of ruin are to be compared only to the consequences of the obedience of Christ in the order of restoration. On the other hand, if it be maintained that the Apostle speaks here of the entrance of sin as a form and example which induced the whole posterity of Adam to sin, his statement is reduced to an absurdity. For there would be question of a sin which could have corrupted no man, since there were then no men to be induced by the example. And if it be argued that the influence of the example began, not at the moment when the sin was committed, but only after Adam had generated sons and daughters, and had narrated to them what happened in Paradise, is it not far more probable that posterity instead of finding an incentive would have experienced a horror of the sin narrated in Scripture and preserved to the present day ? More need not be said of this theory which was already propounded by the Pelagians and successfully refuted by their adversary, Saint Augustine (*De Peccatorum Meritis et Remissione*, c. 9, n. 9 ; c. 10-13 ; c. 15, n. 19) ; unfortunately, however, the arguments of this great Father seem unknown to the advocates of the " moral-influence " theory of the Redemption, i. e. to those who correspondingly reduce also the redeeming work of Christ to a mere example of love, to its psychological influence on our lives.

(3) Finally, we shall now show in the third part of our discussion that in Rom. v, 12-19 ἡ ἁμαρτία is not used to denote by metonymy the effect or penalty of sin, but in the

obvious and immediate sense to designate sin truly and properly so-called.

(a) That in Rom. v, 12-19 ἡ ἁμαρτία is not used in an accomodated sense is evident from the following : firstly, according to the rules of sane exegesis metaphorical interpretations are not to be presumed but proved by clear arguments, and are not to be adopted unless the obvious and literal interpretation is opposed to the context or to the analogy of reason or faith. Secondly, since death is the special penalty of sin, such interpretation would render meaningless the expression, καὶ διὰ τῆς ἁμαρτίας ὁ θάνατος ; in fact, as we have shown above, in both parts of v. 12 ἡ ἁμαρτία is clearly stated to be the cause of death and death the effect of the former. Thirdly, the above interpretation is inadmissible because of theological reasons, since it would make God inflict death, the penalty of sin, on those who were without sin. Finally, the immediate context authorizes no such interpretation : the Apostle indicates the character of this sin when he says that by it we were enemies of God (v. 10), by it we were constituted sinners (vv. 18, 19), by it is God's judgment unto condemnation (vv. 16,18), from which redeemed by Christ we are justified in His blood and saved from wrath (v. 9), are reconciled to God and receive reconciliation (vv. 10,15), etc. All these expressions imply sin in the true sense of the word.

It might however be objected that the ἡ ἁμαρτία of which Saint Paul speaks in Rom. v, 12-19 is the same as that in c. VI and VII, i. e. concupiscence, or sin improperly so-called. We have already indicated above the solution of this apparent difficulty: ἡ ἁμαρτία in c. VI and VII is considered from a different view-point than in c. V. In the latter it is regarded as a *reatus culpae,* which was introduced into humanity by the transgression of Adam, is the cause of penalty formally as such, and is opposed to and excluded by the justice of Christ. In c. VI and VII it is considered in so far as it is the cause of those lusts and appetites to which if we consent we sin, i. e., in so far as it is concupiscence inclining to sin. Both aspects constitute an *unum totum* under the appellation of ἡ ἁμαρτία, and when the justice of Christ is infused the *culpa* is blotted out but concupiscence remains.

(b) Ἡ ἁμαρτία, then, has really and properly the character of sin. In the first place, it is represented by the Apostle as the reason and cause of a penalty, death. This death is not

considered by Saint Paul as a mere evil, but formally as a penalty, i. e., as inflicted by the law against the sinner. This idea is developed by the Apostle in a subsequent passage : " For until the law sin (ἁμαρτία without art.) was in the world, but sin was not imputed, when the law was not. But death reigned from Adam unto Moses, even over them also who have not sinned after the similitude of the transgression of Adam, who is a figure of him who was to come " (Rom. v, 13, 14). The Apostle, accordingly, argues from the universality of death in pre-Mosaic times. The Law of Moses inflicted the penalty of death upon some of the graver crimes ; but prior to the time of Moses there was no positive divine law entailing death for its violation. Hence in that period death was not the punishment of actual sin but of some other sin, namely, original sin, introduced into humanity by the transgression of Adam. For, as the Apostle again affirms, during the whole period which elapsed from Adam to the promulgation of the Mosaic Law, ἁμαρτία (without art.) was in the world, i. e. men committed actual sins. Nevertheless, these actual sins were not imputed, were not punished with death, because there was no positive divine law imposing the penalty of death on actual sin ; there was only the natural moral law whose violation was imputed but not unto physical death. Yet throughout that period from Adam unto Moses death reigned over the whole human race, even over those who did not transgress any positive law entailing death as its punishment as in the case of Adam. Hence in the above reasoning of the Apostle we have at once a proof of the existence of original sin and of its character as sin properly so-called : for a sin which is the cause of a penalty formally as such is itself formally sin; since, however, this sin which is the cause of penalty is not solely the personal act of Adam but a sin which inheres in all, this sin which is represented by Saint Paul as common to all is sin really and properly so-called [1].

1. WENDT, *System der christlichen Lehre*[2], p. 256, attempts to find in original sin an imputation which would correspond to the Lutheran notion of imputed justice : " der Begriff ἥμαρτον ist von einem ideellen Sündiggewordensein zu verstehen. Ein ideelles Sündigsein besteht darin dasz man von Gott wie ein Sünder betrachtet und behandelt wird ". This interpretation meets the double difficulty of conceiving that God regards as sinners those who are not really so, and of finding a reasonable sense for this phrase : all were treated as sinners by the disobedience of Adam. The sin therefore which invades humanity by the fault of one is not merely an extrinsic denomination. It constitutes all men sinners, even those who did not imitate the

Again, the Sin which entered into the world through Adam is opposed to the justice procured for us by Christ, a justice which we *now* receive, by which we are constituted just, and whose fruit is the possession of the kingdom and " reign in life " (Rom. v, 15, 18). Now the Sin which is opposed to that justice, which is excluded by that justice which we *now* receive, cannot be but sin properly so-called. For if it is not sin formally as such, it is not *now* excluded by the justice of Christ because the other evils and penalties of sin still remain. And if this be the case, what is the difference between sin and the justice of Christ ? Can in this case Saint Paul's antithesis between Adam, the one cause of sin and death, and Christ, the one source of justice and life, have any meaning? How can he say that as we were constituted sinners by Adam we were also constituted just by Christ (Rom. v, 19), events, which surely take place during men's earthly existence ?

B. *Comparison of* Rom. v, 12-19 *with* Rom. vii, 7 ff., I Cor. xv, 45 ff., Gal. iv, 8 and Rom. i, 18-32.

Having developed the Pauline doctrine of original sin as contained in Rom. v, 12-19, we may now proceed to compare that passage with certain other texts which seem at first sight to be opposed to it. Owing to the teaching of several Protestant theologians we are again obliged to revert to a study of the relation of Rom. c. v and vii. Certain critics as Holtzmann [1] and Clemen [2] maintain that the psychological and historical causes of sin, the former derived from Greek philos-

---

transgression of Adam. It draws on all a sentence of condemnation, and becomes proper to each one in the same way as the grace and justice which Christ brings us. " That something real and not merely imputed is meant ", says DRUMMOND, art. *On the Meaning of " Righteousness of God " in the Theology of St. Paul "*, H G. 1903, p. 284, " seems to me obvious from the whole bearing of the passage, which would become absurd if it were possible to suppose that men had not really died and had not been really sinful. Sin and death are universal and admitted realities, which men inherit by the mere fact of their being men. Righteousness and life must be equally real : as we have born the image of the earthly, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly. "

1. *Lehrbuch der neutestamentlichen Theologie* [2], vol. II, p. 50, 56 : the author speaks of " widerstreitende Aussage über den Ursprung der Sünde " and ,, ungelöste Antinomie " in regard to Saint Paul's teaching concerning the origin of sin.

2. *Die christliche Lehre von der Sünde*, p. 215, similarly speaks of " ein unlösbarer Widerspruck über den Ursprung der Sünde " in the Pauline Epistles.

ophy and the latter from Jewish theology, are two absolutely different and irreconcilable currents of thought in Saint Paul's Epistles. According to others as Rashdall [1], Peake [2], and Feine [3], there is only one cause of sin, namely, the psychological, so that the sin of Adam (Romans c. v) is only a particular application of a general rule. But we have already explained above that Saint Paul does not present the connection between flesh and sin, which he developes especially in Rom. c. vii, as something natural but as historically introduced by the fall of our first parent. For if in Rom. v, 12, the Apostle categorically states that ἡ ἁμαρτία entered the world by the transgression of Adam, are we not to conclude therefore that this power did not exist in our first parent before his transgression ? And if in c. vii of the same epistle the flesh is considered as an abode and instrument of this ἡ ἁμαρτία, it is a priori probable that the flesh is not considered here from the sole view-point of its nature but as it historically existed in the descendants of Adam. The carnal Jew of Rom. vii, enslaved to sin, is the historic man, the descendant of Adam. In fact, the narrative of the fall in Genesis occupies the Apostle's thought throughout the first part of the Epistle, and we are naturally led from Rom. c. v to c. vii ; thus the Apostle says : " by one man sin (ἡ ἁμαρτία) entered into this world " (v, 12), " by the disobedience of one man many were made sinners (ἁμαρτωλοί) (v, 19), " sin (ἡ ἁμαρτία) reigned unto death " (v, 21), " our old man is crucified with him that the body of sin (σῶμα τῆς ἁμαρτίας) may be destroyed " (vi, 6), " let not sin (ἡ ἁμαρτία) therefore reign in your mortal body, so as to obey the lusts thereof " (vi, 12), " the wages of sin (ὀψώνια τῆς ἁμαρτίας) is death " (vi, 23), " I do not know sin (τὴν ἁμαρτίαν οὐκ ἔγνων) but by the law " (vii, 7) etc. From the above passages we see what intimate connection exists between the psychological and the historical cause of sin, the latter being prior to and explaining the former, and how naturally they join each other [4].

1. O. c., p. 89 : " It is natural to infer that Adam's fall was itself the necessary result of his fleshly nature ".

2. O. c., p. 24, says that Adam was the natural man moulded from the dust. " The sin latent in us was also latent in him, and at the touch of the Law it was roused to activity ".

3. O. c., p. 261 ff.

4. Cf. Cornely, o. c., p. 339, Lemonnyer, o. c., p. 284, Goguel, o. c., pp. 143, 146.

Nevertheless, are we not authorized to infer the purely natural character of the struggle between the constitutive elements of the human composite from I Cor. xv, 45 ff., where the Apostle describes the first man not as he is after the fall but as he was originally at creation ? Thus Saint Paul says : ἐγένετω ὁ πρῶτος ἄνθρωπος Ἀδὰμ εἰς ψυχὴν ζῶσαν, ὁ ἔσχατος Ἀδὰμ εἰς πνεῦμα ζωοποιοῦν, and again : ὁ πρῶτος ἄνθρωπος ἐκ γῆς χοϊκός, ὁ δεύτερος ἄνθρωπος ἐξ οὐρανοῦ (xv, 45, 47). In these passages where Saint Paul is referring to the moment of creation is not Adam represented as possessing a natural and fleshly body, whose vivifying principle is the ψυχὴ (cf. vv. 42-44) ? Such an earthly body, would it not be inclined to sin, would it not have its lusts and concupiscences corresponding to its own nature and hostile to the superior element ? Here again, however, we think there is no inconsistency between the above and Rom. v, 12-19. If the Apostle on the one hand represents the appetites of the flesh as natural to it, and on the other hand regards them as historically introduced by the transgression of Adam, it is because he saw no opposition between the two truths. According to what we have said above, in the state of primitive justice (cf. Gen. ii, 25 ; iii, 7, 16 ff. ; Rom. v, 12 ; I Cor. xv) in which Adam lived before his transgression, that which is natural to the flesh was suspended and neutralized by a privilege. In I Cor. xv, 45 the Apostle considers the state of Adam and his descendants such as it results from creation and such as Sin has restablished it without paying any attention to the intermediary stage of justice through which humanity had passed before the fall ; besides, in the parallelism which the Apostle establishes between the psychic humanity of Adam and the " pneumatic " humanity of Christ he had no reason to mention this intermediary state. The above passage therefore introduces no new current of thought concerning the origin of sin different from that in Rom. v, 12, 19.

Some again find an opposition between Rom. v, 12-19, and Gal. iv, 8 : " But then indeed not knowing God you served them who by nature are not gods ". Whereas in the former the Apostle says that the cause of sin is Adam's transgression and disobedience, here he seems to say that the cause of sin is ignorance. In solving this apparent difficulty we would recall what we have already said in the first chapter of our

study. The Apostle does not explain in Gal. IV, 8 whether this ignorance was absolute or partial nor how it came about. According to Romans, which developes more fully the ideas contained in Galatians, ignorance of God the Creator is a culpable ignorance which obscures the intelligence so that the heathen fell into idolatry (I, 20 ff.). Furthermore, in Galatians the Apostle enumerates as works of the flesh not only idolatry but almost the same vices which in Romans he attributes to the wilful rejection of the light of Nature (Gal. V, 19, 21 ; Rom. I, 20 ff.). Hence if the pagans rejected the light of Nature and fell into idolatry it was because of the power of the flesh. Now we have seen above what meaning Saint Paul attributes to " flesh " : it is the natural man as Sin, introduced into the human race by Adam's transgression, had made him.

According to certain authors as Goguel, [1] Saint Paul is said to give us a new psychological explanation of the origin of sin in Rom. I, 18-32, of the origin of sin not in the individual but in the race. In fact, the same author tells us that we have in Rom. I, 18-32 more precise information concerning the nature of the original fall : it is probable that for Saint Paul the narrative of Genesis concerning the disobedience of Adam was nothing more than an allegory of the idolatry of the first men. We shall not stop to consider here these arbitrary assertions, for there is absolutely no evidence that Saint Paul allegorized the narrative of Genesis or that he established any relation between the idolatry of the first men and the disobedience of Adam in the above sense.

Finally, in Eph. II, 3 the Apostle traces the universal sinfulness of all mankind, of both Jews and Gentiles, though indirectly, to original sin : καὶ ἡμεῖς πάντες ἀνεστράφημέν ποτε ἐν ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις τῆς σαρκὸς ἡμῶν, ποιοῦντες τὰ θελήματα τῆς σαρκὸς καὶ τῶν διανοιῶν, καὶ ἤμεθα τέκνα φύσει ὀργῆς ὡς καὶ οἱ λοιποί. That there is question here of the whole of humanity, of both Jews and Gentiles, becomes clear if the meaning of ἡμεῖς is opposed to that of οἱ λοιποί. But how can all be said to be children of wrath, and that φύσει ? They were objects of wrath because they obeyed the " desires and will of the flesh ", i. e., by committing actual sin, and they were sinners φύσει, because of their fallen nature, unaided by grace. The term φύσει occurs several times in the Pauline Epistles : in Rom. II,

1. O. c., pp. 152-156.

14 we read that Gentiles φύσει do the things of the law, that is, without revelation ; here " by nature " is opposed to " by revelation ". In Gal. II, 15 where Saint Paul speaks of those who are Jews " by nature " as distinguished from proselytes, " by nature " is equivalent to " by birth ". In Gal. IV, 8 we learn of those who are not gods by nature, that is, " by constitution ", " essentially ". The meaning of φύσει in Eph. II, 3 is to be determined, accordingly, in its context, by the latent or explicit contrast which it implies. Now φύσει is opposed not to the Law or any other privilege which distinguished the Jews from other nations, but solely to the grace of the new economy. The Jews and Gentiles were by nature, φύσει, sinners and children of wrath, because of their evil inclinations and concupiscences inherited from the first parent, because of nature left to itself and unaided by grace ; but now like the Christian converts they are renewed by grace (II, 4, 5, 8), risen in Christ (II, 5, 6), etc. Hence while in Eph. II, 3, the existence of original sin is not directly affirmed, it is nevertheless supposed and sufficiently indicated as the source of the evil inclinations of our nature ; the term φύσει, considered in its special context and in the Pauline theology in general, necessarily demands this supposition [1].

C. *Modern Theories of Original Sin.*

Having seen above the Pauline teaching concerning original sin as it is developed in his different Epistles, we may now briefly consider the attitude of modern thought towards the same doctrine. According to the exponents of the " New Theology ", " while science repudiates the doctrine of a fall as untrue, criticism regards it as unnecessary " [2]. Original sin, we are told, has been confounded with the general tendency of mankind towards actual sin, and a hypothetical cause of the universality of sin has been mistaken for the observed manifestations of sinful volition. Original sin, it is said, is not a fact but an inference, an alleged conjectural explanation

1. Cf. ZORELL, o. c., p. 611, PRAT, o. c., vol. II[6], pp. 70-73, VOSTÉ, *Commentarius in epistolam ad Ephesios*, pp. 253-260, G. S. HITCHCOCK, *The Epistle to the Ephesians*, pp. 144-150. COLON, *Justice et justification d'après le Nouveau Testament*, pp. 77-79.

2. F. R. M. HITCHCOCK, *The Atonement and Modern Thought*, p. 11-12.

of facts; besides, in its traditional form it offers violence to the moral consciousness [1] It is said to have no basis in Scripture, and Saint Paul is supposed to have derived his conception of Adam and of the fall from free Jewish speculation and from the fancies of Jewish Cabalists and Haggadists. But more than this, evolutionary anthropological science has rendered belief in a primitive state of innocence almost impossible. Psychology and biology make acceptance of the idea that human nature could be deranged by an act of sin, and that such an effect if caused could be propagated by physical heredity, extremely difficult. The theory of evolution is able to supply an explanation of the presence in man of appetite and impulse which prompt the will to sin, and so remove all necessity to invoke a " catastrophic fall " in order to account for the universal prevalence of sin. In the face of these affirmations and assumptions it is fitting that we study the modern theories on original sin.

(1) *The Evolutionist Theory of Original Sin.*

According to some evolutionists man has by a slow gradation arisen from an ape or cognate condition. He acquired his higher powers through favorable variations of mind and body, preserved by natural selection and accumulated during long ages of semi-brutishness and savagery, until he has attained to his present happier intellectual and moral conditions. In this theory man's origin is pushed back so far, his primitive condition is pictured as so brutish, such countless milleniums of animalism intervene before he gets a start on the ladder of civilisation, that the idea of a fall from an original state of integrity becomes inconceivable. Hence the doctrine of a fall as taught by Genesis and Saint Paul is ruled out by evolutionary science as inherently absurd. Thus Thomson [2] says : " We are no longer as those who look back to a paradise in

1. B. Jowett, *The Epistles of St. Paul to the Thessalonians, Galatians, and Romans*, p. 314-315 : " The difficulty of supposing him (Saint Paul) to be allegorizing the narrative of Genesis is slight, in comparison with the difficulty of supposing him to countenance a doctrine at variance with our first notions of the moral nature of God " ; cf. also Denney, art. *Fall* (Biblical), ERE, vol. V, pp. 701-705.

2. *Bible of Nature*, p. 226.

which man fell ; we are rather as ' those who rowing hard against the stream, see distant gates of Eden gleam, and do not dream it is a dream ' ". So too Sir Oliver Lodge [1] : " as for ' original sin ' or ' birth sin ' or other notion of that kind, — by which is partly meant the sin of his parents, — that sits absolutely lightly on him (the higher man of to-day). ...Whatever it be, it is not a business for which we are responsable. We did not make the world ; and an attempt to punish us for animal origin and ancestry would be simply comic ".

What the Church therefore names original sin is from the standpoint of evolutionary science an inheritance of man from his brute ancestry — an inheritance which in its ceaseless struggle upwards the race is continually throwing off. " Original sin " means for the evolutionists the solicitations of the lower nature, conceived of proleptically as sin because they constitute its potentiality. These inherited appetitive propensities are necessarily and normally inherent in human nature in virtue of our animal ancestry. They are " stock tendencies ", morally neutral and non-moral in virtue of their necessary presence at birth. They are a pre-condition of human morality. Yet, it is precisely these neutral and non-moral " conative " elements, fixed by heredity in the human species without exception, that account for race solidarity in sinfulness. It is they that are original, innate, and universal.

Many Christian theologians think that the facts of sin and disorder of the world can be accounted for, in harmony with a true idea of sin, on the ground of such a picture of man's origin as stated above. The position usually taken in these irenical attempts is that there is room for the facts of man's moral life even in such a view of his origin. Be the starting point as low as it may, there is necessarily, it is said, a stage in man's development when moral sense awakens, and rudimentary ideas of right and wrong begin to be formed. Then the

---

1. *Man and the Universe*, pp. 220, 17 ; so too L. Abbot (London, 1897), *The Theology of an Evolutionist*, p. 48, writes : " The origin of sin does not lie in remote history... when we indulge our appetite or our greed. . we are falling back into the animal, from which we are not yet emerged. Every man is two men, — a centaur, part animal, part man. Some have almost outgrown the animal, and some have a very small men's head on a very large beast's body ". Cf. also Grosjean, *La rédemption, d'après Franz Leenhardt*, p. 28 ff.

crisis arrives : as endowed with freedom, the individual can choose good and evil, and with wrong choice sin begins.

According to W. L. Walker original sin consists in a failure to respond to the " law of progressive life " and to the " highest spiritual environment " ; " there has thus been ", he says, " a real ' Fall '. It was in the refusal of the higher law, or in the lower choice, that sin makes its appearance in the world. It did not need to ' come in ' from anywhere. Its possibility was there in that animal nature in which man stood rooted. His yielding to this, instead of following the higher law that shone upon him, was the ' Fall of man ' " [1]. So too Scott thinks that there has been " no more serious anchorage of divine truths to unstable arguments " as the " attempt to base the truth of the Atonement upon the account of the Fall as recorded in the chapter of Genesis " [2], and deems it best for his purpose to assume that the account is unhistorical. Starting from the same evolutionist premises as the above, he concludes : " Man was evolving a conscience, and by the possession of that conscience he was doomed to experience what he must feel to be a fall " [3].

An attempt to combine the evolutionist and theological explanation of sin has recently been made by Hall, Professor of Theology in the Western Theological Seminary of Chicago. Hall thinks that the present state of scientific knowledge compels us to accept the theory that man has derived his physical organism from brute ancestors, but rejects the hypothesis that his distinctive mental, moral, and religious qualities are thus derived. He regards the fall as a reversion to the limitations and liabilities of man's unassisted and created nature, i. e., to the condition which natural evolution engenders when not supplemented by supernatural gifts and graces. " According to the evolutionary theory ", he says, " man possessed a nature in which inherited animal propensities were too strong for the as yet undeveloped moral instincts which called for their restraint... We may at once acknowledge that natural evolution accounts for the internal conflict which Catholic theology explains by its doctrine of the fall, and maintain that this conflict would have been prevented from becoming

1. *The Cross and the Kingdom*, p. 301.
2. *The Atonement*, pp. 352-353.
3. Ibid., p. 365.

actual, if man had rightly employed the supernatural advantages that were offorded to our first parents " [1].

Finally, we may mention, only as a matter of curiosity, the Cabalistic origin of sin propounded by Woods [2]. This author conceives evolution as a sort of pantheistic emanation. The Eden of Saint Paul, he tells us, is not the Eden of the " plenary inspirationalist ". Eden to one trained in Cabala was a great spiritual allegory, dealing with the dim beginnings of man in states long previous to any of which we have historical record. And from the prominence which Saint Paul gives to the story it is conceivable, the author thinks, the he was instructed in the mystery of which it was the imperfect expression. It must be emphasized, Woods again tells us, that Eden is not a place in the physical universe, neither is its matter -- the " dust " from which the Cabalistic androgyne " Adam " was created — any form of the matter with which we are at present familiar. In Genesis c. II we read that the man or race on its first creation was " alone ", i. e., androgynous. Two falls are comprised in the allegory : the first, the fall into separate sexes, and the second, the inevitable fall into denser, physical matter through a false understanding of the true sex relation. The sin then which brought death into the world was a " prostituted sex-indulgence ". Yet the roots of that sin must be sought in the state which rendered such indulgence possible. " The true Fall, or the birth of abstract ἁμαρτία, was marked by the passing of the race out of the androgyne state into distinct male and female " [3]. This fall we are told involved " no moral choice, and was the subject of Divine approval " [4]. But sex-separation was only an outward expression of a " changed spiritual attitude ", of an interior vital separation from the " Central Unity " which occurred at a definite point in the early life of the race ; so that the " true fall lay in the turning of the will from God towards the self ". In this way then Woods would have us proceed in interpreting Saint Paul's statement that " by one man's disobedience sin entered the

1. *Evolution and the Fall*, pp. 211-212 (cf. also p. 139) ; cf. also BERNARD, art. *Fall*, HDB, vol. I, pp. 839-845.
2. *The Gospel of Rightness*, p. 104 ff.
3. Ibid., p. 108.
4. Ibid., p. 109.

world, and death through sin " [1]. Much need not be said in refutation of this system for to state it is to refute it. Even in the brief resume we have here given one can easily detect the main characteristic of the Cabala, namely, a travesty of the Bible doctrine, a characteristic which is furthermore confirmed by a study of the historical origins of the Cabala. Moreover, a Jew with his conception of a Holy God, a unique Being, Creator and Conserver, would never have admitted the gross anthropomorphisms, the gnostic emanations, and the pantheism which underlie the Cabalistic system.

It might now be interesting to quote some of the Pauline texts which the evolutionists without any regard for context frequently quote in behalf of their theory. A text which is continually adduced is that of I Cor. xv, 46 : " Yet that was not first which is spiritual but that which is natural ; afterwards that which is spiritual " As similarly illustrating the *terminus a quo* and *terminus ad quem* of the evolutionary process, I Cor. xv, 47 is often cited : " The first man was of the earth, earthly; the second man, from heaven, heavenly ". Again, as illustrative of their teaching concerning hereditary instincts and animal propensities such passages as Rom. viii, 7, where the Apostle speaks of the " carnal mind ", and Rom. vii, 23, where he speak of a " law in the members " are adduced. Finally the antithesis between the " old " and the " new man " in Eph. iv, 22-24, is regarded as incapable of a satisfactory interpretation except on the supposition of evolutionist principles [2]. What is to be said of the above method of employing Scripture ? We have already explained the sense of such passages as Rom. vii, 23 and viii, 7, when we discussed the psychological cause of sin. I Cor. xv, 47, has likewise been explained above when we compared that passage with Rom. v, 12, 19 ; it will receive further attention when we come to discuss the cause of death, and the relation of the first and Second Adam. The expression

1. *The Gospel of Rightness*, p. 111.

2. Cf. Denney, *The Christian Doctrine of Reconciliation*, p. 200, W. L. Walker, o. c., p. 286 ; Woods, o. c., p. 20, says a propos of Eph. iv, 22, 24 : " It is occasionally brought against the Apostle that he did not anticipate the modern doctrine of evolution, as applied to the human soul. But in this expression we seem to have traces of the evolutionary idea, for the injunction to " put off " the old man is meaningless unless he be the product of an evolution that is past, and therefore an anachronism in the evolution that is in progress. His age rather than his nature, is the thing against him ".

in Eph. IV, 22, 24, the " old and the new " man, designates two consecutive states of the same man, given up at first to the influences of Sin of which Adam is the source and then to those of grace of which Christ is the dispenser : the " old man " who in principle dies at baptism, whom the Apostle invites us to put off, is the inheritance from our first parent, it is our fallen and corrupted nature, the carnal " ego " of Rom. c. VII ; the " new " man, who succeeds the former, is regenerated man under the influence of the Spirit [1]. So too in I Cor. XV, 44, 46, there is no question of evolution but of a distinction between our present natural bodies whose controlling principle is the ψυχή and our glorified bodies after the resurrection whose controlling principle is the πνεῦμα; historically the natural body comes first, the spiritual body comes through Christ.

Critics, somehow or another, cannot cease to misinterpret Saint Paul. Formerly we heard of " Paul the Pharisee " and of " Paul the Pagan " : on the one hand the Apostle was represented as so exclusively Jewish and Pharisaic in his theological elaborations that the " modern mind " simply could not accept his doctrine because founded on a mistaken rabbinic exegesis of the Old Testament ; on the other hand his Gospel was represented as a collection of dogmas, derived from paganism and the Mystery-religious, and united into a system by the forceful intellect of the Apostle. And, behold ! now we learn of " Paul the Evolutionist ", nay, even of " Paul the Cabalist ". And what will it be next, we ask with no small curiosity ? Will modern theologians ever agree to consider Saint Paul in that role which he always so emphatically vindicated for himself, namely, as the " Apostle of Jesus Christ ", the " bond-servant of Jesus Christ ", the " prisoner of Jesus Christ " ?

The hypothesis of the evolutionists has therefore no basis

---

1. The *old man* is not Adam, but yet is not without relation to Adam. He is under the influence of the σάρξ, the ψυχή, and the νοῦς. An inheritance from our first parent, he is our fallen nature, the carnal " ego " of Rom. c. VII. He walks according to the flesh, is submitted to its concupiscences, and accomplishes its works which are the works of darkness (Rom. XIII, 14 ; Gal. V, 16-25). He is not crucified to the world (Gal. VI, 14-17), but lives for himself (II Cor. V, 15).

The *new man* is not Jesus Christ, but yet is not without relation to Him.

in the Pauline Epistles. But there are other serious reasons which militate against the acceptance of this theory. For it is evident that not only a particular theory of the origin of sin is put in question by the evolutionary conception, but the very idea of sin in the Christian sense is essentially altered. Sin is not only a moral fault but it is fundamentally opposition to God and transgression of His law. But how shall we judge of this " miserable, half-starved, naked, wretch, just emerged from the bestial condition, torn with fierce passions, and fighting his way among his compeers with low-brow cunning ", who has not even a glimmer of a right knowledge of God ? Is not sin for him a natural necessity of ascent, a something therefore unavoidable in his history, exceedingly venial, if hardly imputable at all ? Sin implies relation to God and possession of enough knowledge of the moral law to enable man to act rightly ; it implies a voluntary departure from rectitude and postulates freedom. But how can we look for these requisites among our " scions of the Simian stock " ?

Moreover, evolution cannot explain man's existing moral condition. For the higher nature tends to be in bondage to the lower, a state, which the mere presence of animal propensities cannot explain to the satisfaction of the moral law. Again, if there are really, not simply natural, but positively evil tendencies in the soul, if these as evil imply a voluntary cause, then the " ape and tiger " theory of original sin becomes ipso facto inadequate. For sin in principle is traceable to a God-denying egoism, to a self-will that exalts itself above God and moral law alike. Is it within the province of evolution to furnish an explanation of such a perverted moral condition ? Is there not more than naturalness in such a state, is there not sin, guilt ? Do not all these considerations point to the Pauline doctrine of the origin of sin as the only true one ?

Finally, it might be asked if there is any unanimity at all among evolutionists in regard to the following questions :

He is under the influence of the πνεῦμα, he is the regenerated man who by grace partakes of the divine life. He is a " new creature " (II Cor. v, 17 ; Gal. vi, 15), endowed with faith and charity (Gal. v, 6), observing the commandments of God (I Cor. vii, 19), walking in good works (Eph. ii, 10), clad with the armour of light (Eph. v, 8-12 ; Rom. xiii, 12) ; he has " put on Christ " (Gal. iii, 27), lives for God in Christ (Rom. vi, 5, 11 ; II Cor. v, 17), walks in the Spirit (Gal. v, 16-25), is the adopted son and heir (Gal. iv, 6, 7 ; Rom. viii, 16).

Firstly, is man, in his physical genesis a slow development from the animal, or is he in a true sense a higher creation ? Are not some of the greatest scientists disposed to admit " jumps ", " saltations ", " big lifts " not only in nature but especially in the origin of man, a " leap ", which would include not only the physical but also the psychical ? Is not the task of establishing actual links of connection between man and anthropoid ancestors, or of even constructing a plausible phylogeny, a standing difficulty ? Secondly, are man's mental and moral powers a development from lower psychical forms, or do they likewise represent a rise not in degree only but in kind upon the psychical forms below ? Are not eminent scientists inclined seriously to doubt the assertion that the same causes which are held adequate to explain physical development suffice also to explain the higher intellectual, moral, and religious powers of man ? If there is reason to doubt whether man, physically, is a product of slow continuous development, a fortiori must not this doubt attach more strongly to his mental development in which the contrast to the merely animal stage is so much greater ? Thirdly, is man, as existing, an advance on an original brutishness and savagery, and does his past extend through countless milleniums, or is his origin more recent ? Are not scientific experts widely at variance on this subject ? Is not the presence of man in Tertiary times still doubtful ? Is there not a tendency to-day to bring down the close of the Glacial period, when man is supposed to appear, to a much later time than was earlier supposed ? Is not the relation of man to interglacial periods still involved in much obscurity ? In fact, is not " primitive man " still an enigma [1] ? In view of these considerations, on what grounds have the authors noted above the right to make inroads into the domain of theology and in the name of " science " to brush aside truths which stand on their own grounds of evidence? Have not rather these vain efforts demonstrated that the Apostle's doctrine of original sin is an interpretation of " eternal and permanent realities ", and that in consequence his doctrine of the Redemption is much more true to nature than that beggarly and denatured conception which, as we shall later see, these same authors present to us ?

1. Cf. Hugueny, art. *Adam et le péché originel*, RT, 1911, pp. 64-88.

(2) *Psychological Theory of the Origin of Sin.*

Intimately related to the above and equally unsatisfactory are those explanations of the origin of sin known as the psychological or empirical theories. We have already seen in dealing with the relation of original sin to the Redemption the tendency of many Protestant theologians to seek a basis for the latter solely in religious experience and in the individual conscience. The fact that moral evil is present in the race, they say, that it is diffused through all its members, that there is a ceaseless and uncompromising reaction against it, are facts independent of our knowledge or ignorance of the first man, and sufficient to create a need of reconciliation and of redemption. The exponents of this view confine their inquiry first of all to empirical and scientific observation, and only afterwards advance to religious or philosophical explanations. Since it is not our purpose here to give a detailed exposition of these theories but only to compare them with the Pauline doctrine of sin and Redemption, it is sufficient to mention very briefly the efforts that have been made in this direction.

According to O. Pfleiderer [1] the source of evil is to be found in the course of the development of the finite will as it struggles for independence. The essence of man's will is a tendency towards the satisfaction of his natural impulses, but this tendency is not evil in itself. The recognition of the moral ought evolves only gradually and gives the law to man to subordinate his self-will to its prohibition. Morality therefore is not immediately given in the mind nor fully developed at the start. The transition from the pre-moral stage to the morally conscious is too gradual to allow the first actual sin to be delected, but there is imputation at each particular stage according as conscience developes. As to original sin the author finds a basis for this in our evil inclination, but this element being natural cannot properly be called evil. While that which is evil in man, namely, the tendency of will asserting itself against the law, since it does not belong to the premoral stage, cannot properly be called natural.

---

1. *Philosophy of Religion* (E. T., London, 1886), vol. IV, pp. 34-38; for an appreciation of the systems of Kant, Ritschl, Müller, and others cf. Orchard, *Modern Theories of Sin*, pp. 29-89, F. R. M. Hitchcock, o. c., pp. 1-47.

Tennant [1] proposes a similar theory. Morality and responsibility, according to this author, are only gradually developed in the race and in the individual. The human infant is simply a non-moral animal. " The task before the new-born moral agent " is that of " moralising his own nature ". Here too is to be found the source or occasion of universal sinfulness : it is the general failure to effect on all occasions the moralisation of inevitable impulses and to choose the end of higher worth. The way from nature to character is accordingly very laborious. Sin is a conscious failure : an individual fails to act up to the best he knows and by failing sins.

It was primarily dissatisfaction with this negative aspect of Tennant's view of the origin of sin which led McDowall [2] to propose a new theory with a view to fill up the *lacunae* of the former. McDowall maintains that, thanks to a clear idea of the uniformity and continuity of the evolutionary process, we can see the completeness and unity of the world plan, and with this conception of unity and continuity the difficulty about the bias of the will disappears. The emergence of will is due to an in-turning of the consciousness on itself, whose immediate purpose is the securing of greater control over matter. It is only by conscious experience that the human being learns that some applications of the will are right and other wrong, according as they tend towards improvement or the opposite. Sin is primarly misuse of this experience : the essence of sin lies in the conscious checking of the efforts of " spirit to create itself in winning free from the determinate katabolism from which it emerges " [3]. This sin is negative in the sense that it is a " failure to moralise the raw material of morality " but yet it is positive in that this failure is due to a conscious misuse of experience [4].

Somewhat similar to the above is the theory developed by Orchard [5] and Hitchcock [6]. These theologians seek a view of sin which would at once be compatible with scientific experience and Christian consciousness. Sin is for them entirely subjec-

---

1. *The Origin and Propagation of Sin*, p. 109.
2. *Evolution and the Need of Atonement*[2], p. 62 ff.
3. Ibid., p. 75.
4. Ibid., pp. 62-82.
5. *Modern Theories of Sin*, pp. 107-157.
6. *The Atonement and Modern Thought*, pp. 48-61.

tive. They insist that we must start from the personal sense of sin, and not from any objective standard. Sin is relative to the sense of sin, which however is not the measure of it since the sense is often in inverse proportion to the fact. This sense which emerges only with the dawning of the moral ideal is due to the feeling of inner discord between what one is and what one ought to be, and has various degrees according to the various stages of moral development. This new experience has not only a moral but a religious aspect, for the consciousness of the moral ideal leads to a consciousness of God. Failure to attain the moral ideal is felt to be separation from God, which in turn causes disquiet until some method of atonement brings relief and peace. This sense of sin as it grows in intensity becomes a harbinger of life, because sin, in the physical discomfort and misery it inflicts, in the moral dissatisfaction and unrest it causes, contains the seed of its own destruction [1]. It is also this sense of sin which leads by induction to the solution of the moral antinomy between the sense of individual responsibility and the universality of sin. This theory regards sin as something that must gradually disappear as the Divine purpose is slowly developed in human life ; it is considered by its authors to lead to a real and spiritual theory of the Atonement which is consummated not only in a union of the separated but in the conquest and destruction of that which separated — the evil habit of the human will.

We have briefly outlined the above theories in order to see what effect such a conception of sin would have on the Pauline doctrine of sin and of the Redemption. For Saint Paul, as we have already shown, sin is a wilful opposition to the natural or revealed law of God. The universality of sin he traces to the lusts and concupiscences of the flesh, which influence the will [2]. In themselves these inclinations and tendencies

1. When Hitchcock o. c., p. 50, says that " there is no better means of creating the sense of sin than the Gospel of Christ ", we would at once wish to ask, how much is there left of the Gospel of Christ especially in the " New Theology " ? And what does remain, far from creating the sense of sin, is it not rather used to excuse our sinfulness ? Does not the author himself admit on page 53 and 147 that sin is far from disappearing in the world and that men " have grown accustomed to it " ?

2. As Sabatier, *L'Apôtre Paul*, p. 311, says : " On se condamne à ne rien comprendre de la doctrine de Paul, si l'on veut voir l'origine du péché dans les déterminations subjectives de la volonté individuelle. Le péché préexiste actuellement en nous à la volonté ". This is true, however, only if

to evil, though inordinate and continually instigating to actual sin, are not sinful. Yet, neither are they a natural or necessary concomitant of the flesh but belong to it in so far as it is the abode and vehicle of that Sin introduced into humanity by the transgression of Adam.

Again, the effort to search in religious experience and in the facts of the individual conscience the whole foundation of the Redemption is likewise irreconciliable with the Pauline doctrine. For, just as one is the author of sin and, what in Scriptural usage denotes all the penalties and consequences of sin, namely, death, so also one is the author of justice and life (Rom. v, 12-19). To consider only the facts of the individual experience, though Saint Paul also recognizes these, is to overlook and set aside what for the Apostle is fundamental. In this view of the origin of sin the distinction between the supernatural and natural orders vanishes, and in consequence the soteriological teaching of the Apostle is rendered meaningless. For, as we indicated above, the new state which we owe to Christ is that of grace and adoption which makes us children of God and heirs of heaven ; but this new state is not only a renewal but also a reparation, not only an elevation but a restoration, not only peace but a renewal of the first alliance, reconciliation. Hence the work whereby Christ procured for us these privileges loses its very *raison d'être* if its basis, the doctrine of Adam's sin, is removed.

The theologians who insist on this theory of sin usually emphasize the corresponding phase of the Redemption, namely, the conferring of the life-giving Spirit, or, as generally happens in modern times, they reduce the whole redeeming work of Christ to its psychological influence on our lives. Now just as sin is not a mere error, mere concupiscence, or a mere evolutionary mistake, but implies above all an opposition to God, a destruction of that order whereby we should tend towards

---

correctly understood. The above theory which we are here criticizing resolves itself in its conclusions into that of Luther. The latter, as we know, claimed that the state in which man was created was not supernatural. The fault of Adam did not deprive our nature of gratuitous gifts, but perverted and corrupted it, not only by depriving it of the power to do good but by inoculating it with concupiscence. Man is therefore fundamentally incapable of doing good but under the force of concupiscence continues necessarily to sin. The influence of Christ did not substantially modify this state. What then is common to this and the above view is that sin is a necessity.

Him as our ultimate end, and in consequence also implies an obligation to undergo penalty, so also the Redemption is not a mere example, not a mere conferring of the vivifying Spirit though a necessary complement of it, but also a penal expiation and a moral reparation. This redeeming work of Christ has an objective value before God independently of its influence on our lives or our subjective appropriation of it.

Finally, the theories noted above present many obscure and objectionable features. For what is meant by such expressions as : " the end of higher worth ", " the efforts of spirit to create itself " etc., and what is this " moral ideal " of which so much is said, how does it arise, and why does it produce the consciousness of sin and guilt ? How does it explain the concept of God's wrath and the universality of sin ? Is not the vagueness with which these explanations are clothed a sufficient reason to make us highly suspicious of their value ? Again, does the natural ancestry of the human race and the existence of the individual before the " moral ideal " dawns upon him, affect the question of responsibility and of sin, or do they not ? In either case, can the above theories consistently give a satisfactory answer ? Finally, if the above theologians say that sin is a universal fact, an apparently inevitable fruit of the human will, others more bold will draw the logical consequences of their premises and conclude that moral evil is a normal fact, rational and necessary, i. e., conformable to the inevitable laws of nature and to the will of God. Subjective redemption then should consist not in the appropriation of the life-giving Spirit of Christ but in self-destruction and suicide.

III. THE ULTIMATE CAUSE OF SIN : SATAN.

Let us recall the results we have thus far obtained in tracing the genealogy of evil. The universality of sin is explained by the misuse of the freedom of the will, but this is due in turn to that which moves the will, namely, the flesh, the instrument and vehicle of Sin. The sinfulness of the flesh we have in turn traced to the disobedience of Adam. But we must still go further backwards. Saint Paul, inspired by the narrative of Genesis and the Book of Wisdom, finds the first instigator of evil in humanity to be Satan, the infernal serpent. Satan seduced

Eve and through her our first parent (II Cor. xi, 3 ; I Tim. ii, 14), and thus brought into the world death (Rom. v, 12), and the " vanity " and " servitude of corruption " (Rom. viii, 20 ff). A dominion thus arose over the visible creature which disrupted the rule of God. Satan now rules the world as the θεὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου (II Cor. iv, 4) ; the earthly ἄρχοντες τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου (I Cor. ii, 6 ff.), and the powers hostile to God, the ἀρχαί, ἐξουσίαι, and δυνάμεις of every kind (I Cor. xv, 24 ff.), stand faithfully at his side.

By Christ's work of Redemption we were essentially freed from the power of Satan as well as from that of ἡ ἁμαρτία. With the aid of Christ's Spirit we can fearlessly stand against and overcome these hostile powers. But just as concupiscence, the effect of original sin, persists in the Christians (Gal. v, 17), so also Satan as its auxiliary continues with God's permission to oppose Christ's kingdom. His present methods of seduction are not unlike to those which he employed in pre-Christian times and still employs in heathendom. It is therefore to this phase of Satan's activity that we shall now direct our study.

CHAPTER II.

The Auxiliaries of Sin.

Art. I. — THE SPIRIT POWERS.

There is perhaps no other phase of Saint Paul's doctrine which is the object of so many superficial observations and insufficient treatment as that of his angelology and demonology [1]. Though the subject of the spirit powers does not hold a prominent place nor form an organic whole in Saint Paul's teaching, it is yet one on which a good deal may be gleaned from his Epistles. The Apostle, it must be remembered, proposed his doctrine concerning angels especially in his oral instructions (I Cor. VI, 3 ; XI, 10 ; II Thess. II, 6). In many of his Epistles he omitted much because the occasion to write on this subject did not present itself, and because he proposed to know nothing among his converts save Christ and Him Crucified. The subject comes more to the front in the Epistles of the Captivity, Colossians and Ephesians, in which Saint Paul was opposing an incipient form of Gnosticism and certain exaggerated tendencies in the worship of angels. But suggestions are not wanting in the earlier Epistles, more especially in I Cor., which are not inconsistent with the more fully developed doctrine of the Colossian Epistle [2].

Among the creatures whom God called into being through His Son there is, according to Saint Paul, a category of beings who bear the name of ἄγγελοι. According to their nature they stand on a higher plane than men ; they have no flesh

1. Thus e. g. Mackintosh, *Historic Theories of Atonement*, p. 72, says in regard to I Cor. II, 6 : " Those ignorant but murderous world-rulers, who outwitted them-selves in crucifying Christ, have moved half-ways in Paul's thoughts from the position of the angel-authors of the law — beings neither strictly good nor strictly bad — and have become almost if not quite evil angels ". The confusion of ideas and lack of distinction in the above passage is evident. We shall show later how Saint Paul is not responsible for all the confusion which is read into his Epistles by modern theologians and on account of which these same authors then in turn tell us that the Pauline doctrine is no longer acceptable to the " logic " (?) of the " modern mind " (?).

2. Cf. Kurze, *Der Engels-und Teufelsglaube des Apostels Paulus*, pp. 7-121.

and blood (Eph. VI, 12) but are invisible spirits (Col. I, 16 ; Eph. VI, 12). Their abode is the supra-terrestrial region (Eph. III, 10) ; nevertheless they are in touch with the world and with human events (I Cor. IV, 9), nay, in special cases they may become visible and be entertained by men (Gal. IV, 14). Their number is very great, and some enjoy a superior rank (I Tim. V, 21). The whole spiritual world is divided into different classes : there are θρόνοι (Col. I, 16), κυριότες (Eph. I, 21 ; Col. I, 16), δυνάμεις (Rom. VIII, 38 ; I Cor. XV, 24), ἀρχαί (Rom. VIII, 38 ; Eph. I, 21 ; III, 10 ; Col. I, 16 ; II, 10) and ἐξουσία (I Cor. XV, 24 ; Eph. III, 10 ; Col. II, 10). But while Saint Paul probably recognized a hierarchy of angels as such, it does not seem to us that he gives in his Epistles a well-defined and formulated gradation of ranks or a specific hierarchical succession.

According to Jones [1], Morgan [2], and Thackeray [3], Saint Paul is said to regard the angels on the whole as antagonistic to God as well as to the best interests of man. But this does not seem to us to be the case. The angels are said to follow intensely the struggles of the messengers of the Gospel (I Cor. IV, 9). They are intrusted with a divine authority to watch over the law of subordination of woman to man, a law established at creation and known to them (I Cor. XI, 10). They possess, and that in a higher measure, spiritual gifts corresponding to the gift of tongues bestowed on men (I Cor. XIII, 1). They can appear to men (Gal. IV, 14), and deliver divine messages to them (Gal. I, 8). The Mosaic Law was given through their mediation (Gal. III, 19). They will one day surround Christ when he comes to judge the world, and transmit to humanity the powerful commands of the universal Judge ; among them will be an archangel who will announce to men the approaching judgment (I Thess. IV, 16 ; I Cor. XV, 52). Their knowledge is progressive and capable of perfection (I Tim. III, 16). They observe man's moral actions and take an interest in them ; Saint Paul calls upon them as witnesses who will appear against Timothy as avengers if he does not heed the exhortations of his master (I Tim. V, 21 ; II Tim. IV, 1). A spiritual being

1. Art. *Saint Paul and the Angels*, Exp., May 1918, p. 356 ff., and June 1918. p. 412 ff.
2. *The Religion and Theology of Paul*, p. 13 ff.
3. *The Relation of St. Paul to Contemporary Jewish Thought*, p. 149 ff.

similar to these meets us in ὀλοθρευτής (I Cor. x, 10), who appears as a divine envoy to avenge the majesty of God (I Tim. v, 21 ; I Cor. ii, 10) [1]. These texts selected from the different Pauline Epistles show that the Apostle recognized a category of angels who were friendly to man and subject to God and His will. If he speaks more often of the evil angels, especially in his exhortations and in his epistle to the Colossians, than he does of the good angels, this fact is due to the special circumstances which called his Epistles forth as well as to the particular Gospel which he preached. Moreover, his attitude to the angels was closely related to his view of the Law and its function.

But, as said above, Saint Paul knows of other angels who are hostile to man and who form an antithesis to the kingdom of God ; these are the angels of darkness, morally bad spirits, whose chief is σατανᾶς (II Cor. xi, 15 ; I Thess. ii, 18). Satan is the cause of infidelity and error. He is an enemy of the faith and seeks to bring about a defection from the Gospel (I Thess. iii, 5). He is the source of all evil that befall the followers of the Christian faith (II Thess. iii, 3). He inspires men to persecute the Christians and to make these go astray in matters of faith and morals (Eph. vi, 16). He is the ultimate source of the dissensions in the Roman community (Rom. xvi, 20). Between Satan and the faithful reigns a state of war ; Satan proceeds against them with great craft and cunning and with skilful equipment; to be able to encounter him, the Christian needs an internal equipment which the Apostle compares with the full armour of a soldier (Eph. vi, 14-18 ; II Cor. xii, 8). But Satan can plot against the Christians only so long as God permits ; ultimately the " God of peace " will destroy him (Rom. xvi, 20).

Secondly, Satan is the cause not only of unbelief but of all other sins. Thus he seeks to seduce married people, who abstain too long from marital relations, to extra-marital satisfaction of the sexual instincts (I Cor. vii, 5). Satan's attempt to seduce men goes back to the time when our first parents walked in Paradise ; by his subtlety he seduced Eve and through her our first parent to infidelity towards God (II Cor. xi, 3).

---

1. Cf. Kurze, o. c., pp. 7-29, Dibelius, *Die Geisterwelt im Glauben des Paulus*, pp. 7-37.

In fact, as an evil and crafty being (I Tim. II, 14) Satan is constantly at work to plunge men into sin and so bring about the damnation of their souls. Christians who do not suppress angry emotions and are not reconciled to their enemy give place to the devil, διάβολος (Eph. IV, 26, 27). The neophyte bishop who is puffed up with pride will receive the same punishment as has befallen the devil (I Tim. III, 6). A bishop who has not a good testimony among those who are without, i. e., among the unbelieving Jews and Gentiles, will most easily fall into the snares of the devil, i. e., into unbelief and other sins (I Tim. III, 7). But not only the bishop but also others Satan seeks to ensnare in his net: young widows by their incontinence have turned aside after Satan and become his followers (I Tim. V, 14 ff.). He awakens hurtful temptations and unprofitable desires in the heart of man, and so leads him to destruction and perdition (I Tim. VI, 9). His tools are the false apostles who work in his interests by employing the same cunning and craft (Eph. VI, 11, 16).

Thirdly, Satan is the cause not only of moral but also of physical misery. The Apostle himself is suffering from a Satanical plague (II Cor. XII, 7, 9). The incestuous Corinthian is expelled from the Christian community and exposed to the dominion of Satan, in order that the lower man, the σάρξ, might be mortified and overcome (I Cor. V, 3, 5). But should the Corinthians fail to pardon the incestuous man they might be " overreached " by Satan, in that he might lead the sinful man to despair and so deprive the punishment of the medicinal purpose intended by the Corinthians (II Cor. II, 11). In I Tim I, 18-20 we have further evidence of an abandonment to Satan's power, an excommunication, where Satan gains control over men and inflicts all kinds of punishment upon them [1].

Fourthly, the special domain of the evil powers is heathendom [2]. So far we have met two names for the evil spirit, namely, σατανᾶς and διάβολος; now in II Cor. VI, 14, 16, we meet a third, βελίαρ. Beliar unmistakably bears the charac-

1. Cf. KURZE, o. c., p. 53 ff., DIBELIUS, o. c., p. 38 ff., EVERLING, *Die paulinische Angelologie und Dämonologie*, p. 21 ff.

2. Cf. PFLEIDERER, *Der Paulinismus*[2], p. 81, B. WEISS, *Biblical Theology* (E. T.), vol. I, p. 359, vol. II, pp. 105, 141, SOMERVILLE, *St. Paul's Conception of Christ*, pp. 297-303.

teristics of Satan, but a new trait appears in that Beliar is brought into connection with idolatry (cf. I Cor. v, 5 ; I Tim. i, 20). Satan, i. e. Beliar, is master over the heathen world as Christ is Lord of God's Kingdom. To the same category as Beliar belongs a multitude of spirits, the δαιμόνια, who are likewise related to the heathen world and idolatry (I Cor. x, 19-21). These morally evil beings, who in reality receive the honor of the sacrifices offered to idols, presumably influence men to bring forth such offerings (I Cor. xii, 2). They inspire the false prophets with spiritual gifts and strength to seduce others (I Tim. iv, 1 ff.), and themselves pursue an end similar to that of Satan, namely, the destruction of the true faith and the spread of error (I Cor. x, 19).

Again, Satan is designated as the ruler of the natural and unregenerate world, as the θεὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου [1]. He fills with his spirit the world estranged from God, and prevents the light of truth from shining in men's hearts. He obscures the minds of both Jews and Gentiles so that the preaching of the Gospel would not move them to faith (II Cor. iv, 4). His influence is reflected in the rulers of this world, the ἄρχοντες τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου [2]. When it is said of the latter that they crucified Christ out of a lack of the σοφία θεοῦ, it was undoubtedly the θεὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου who kept this σοφία from them, who blinded them, and so in last resort caused the death of Christ (I Cor. ii, 6, 8). Another group of associates of the θεὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου we meet in the ἄρχαι, ἐξουσίαι, and δυνάμεις of I Cor. xv, 24 (cf. also Rom. viii, 38), who in subordination to him exercise a dominion over the world estranged from

1. Against Dibelius who, o. c., p. 190 ff., maintains that the conception of " Satan " and that of θεὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος τοῦτου are two divergent currents of thought in the Pauline Epistles.

2. Many exegetes as Feine, o. c., p. 212, Holtzmann, o. c., p. 276, Mackintosh, o. c., p. 72, Everling, o. c., p. 11, Dibelius, o. c., p. 89, understand the ἄρχοντες τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου to mean spirit or demonic powers. But this can hardly be the correct interpretation, and the expression is to be referred to earthly rulers. The context moreover favors this interpretation, for whenever the word σοφία appears in connection with c. 1 or c. 11 it is always applied to men ; are we then to admit a sudden exception for 11, 6-8 ? The wisdom of " this world " and " the rulers of the world " is the same as that of 1, 20, which in turn is the wisdom of the unbelieving Jews and Gentiles and of their princes (cf. 1, 20, 23, 26, 27, 28). Finally it is contrary to what we know of the activity of these spirit-powers to attribute to them the crucifixion ; their role is rather to darken men's minds and seduce to evil. Cf. Kurze, o. c., p. 76 ff.

God. Hence Satan is rightly called θεὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου, because his position is analogous to that of God as Ruler of the world : just as the world in its origin goes back to God, so also sin and all that is transitory in the world goes back to Satan ; just as the Creator rules over the world so also the originator of sin and death rules over ὁ αἰὼν οὗτος, and just as the faithful worship the Lord so also the infidels by their immorality and idolatry render honor to the devil.

But the greatest triumph of his seductive art, of his deception and wiles, Satan will celebrate shortly before the end of the world (II Thess. II, 3-12). He will then produce a unique creature in Antichrist, through whom godlessness and immorality will reach their highest stage in the world. That Antichrist belongs to the same category as Satan is evident from the names, ἄνθρωπος τῆς ἀνομίας and ἄνομος, which Saint Paul attributes to him. He is godlessness incarnate. His activity characterizes him as the true image of the devil. He will oppose and exalt himself over all gods whom men had worshipped up to his time. He will reject all religious services which men had heretofore rendered him, and will lay claim to divine honors. He will occupy the place of Jahveh and persuade men that he is God Himself. The ἄνομος will form a counterpart of the Son of God : as Christ at the end of time so also the Antichrist will be revealed and have his parousia. He will come and work in the spirit of Satan, being directed and endowed with strength by him (II Thess. II, 9). He will perform deeds having the semblance of miracles but which in reality will be nothing but " lying wonders ". Full of unrighteousness himself, he will use every means to attain his purpose, namely, to propagate error and to bring to perdition men who willingly turn away from truth and salvation. But his end will be tragic, for he is destined to destruction : the mere advent of the Son of Man will render him powerless, and the breath of His mouth and the brightness of His coming will destroy him [1].

1. Saint Paul's purpose in writing this section (II Thess. II, 1-12) was to contradict the rumor current among the Thessalonians that the Parousia was to come at any moment. To do this he recalls to the minds of his readers that the Lord's coming would be preceded by two events, the great apostasy and the appearance of the Antichrist, — neither of which had as yet come to pass. True, the forces of Antichrist are already at work, but they are held in check by the restraining power (κατέχων). The difficulty of

We have rapidly gathered from the Pauline Epistles these scattered allusions to Satan and his auxiliaries in order to have a picture of mankind before the Redemption, of humanity as it was in bondage to these supra-terrestrial powers. We have seen that Satan seduces men to all kinds of sin, but that, as the spirit of infidelity and error, he especially seeks to pervert men's hearts and to darken their minds. To have thus a clear idea of Satan's activity will also aid us to understand the redeeming work of Christ, Who " gave himself for our sins that he might deliver us from this present wicked world " (Gal. I, 4). Yet it is not only through Satan that we are held in servitude to sin ; there is still another power whose bondage is as oppressive and as compelling as that of the former, namely, the Mosaic Law. But before discussing the Mosaic Law we must treat another question which is frequently associated with that of the spirit-powers, namely, the meaning of the " elements of the world ", τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου.

Art. II. " THE ELEMENTS OF THE WORLD ".

A question closely connected with the foregoing is that of the meaning of the " elements of the world ". The expression, τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου, appears four times in the Pauline Epistles, twice in Galatians and twice in Colossians :

Gal. IV, 3 : " So we also, when we were children, were serving under the elements of the world ",

Gal. IV, 9 : " But now, after that you have known God, or rather are known by God, how turn you again to the weak and needy elements, which you desire to serve again ? "

Col. II, 8 : " Beware lest any man cheat you by philosophy and vain deceit, according to the tradition of men, according to the elements of the world, and not according to Christ ",

Col. II, 20 : " If then you be dead with Christ from the

---

the passage is due to the fact that the Apostle does not either here or elsewhere explain his teaching on the main points involved, namely, who is, the Antichrist, and what is the restraining power. He makes only general allusions to what he said on a former occasion. Hence any attempt to identify the Antichrist or the restraining power is largely a matter of conjecture. For a discussion of the different opinions cf. Prat, o. c., vol. I⁹, p. 95 ff.; Kurze, o. c., p. 46 ff.

elements of this world, why do you yet decree as though living in the world ? "

Since many modern authors understands the " elements of the world " to refer to spiritual personal beings, it is necessary that we here subject the expression, τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου to a careful analysis. We shall first examine the meaning of the terms στοιχεῖον and κόσμος, secondly we shall study and compare the entire phrase in its different Pauline contexts, and finally we shall examine the modern theories on this subject.

I. THE MEANING OF Στοιχεῖον AND Κόσμος.

A. Στοιχεῖον is found in Greek writers from Aristophanes onwards, and in later Greek writers is of very frequent occurrence. It is related to στοῖχος, a " line ", " row ", " rank ", and its fundamental meaning is apparently " standing in a row", and hence " an element of a series ". The usage of the term from the time of Aristophanes and Plato to that of Plutarch, together with occasional quotations from later authors, yields the following meanings :

(1) Aristophanes [1] uses the term στοιχεῖον to designate the pin of a sun-dial ;

(2) An element of speech, a letter of the alphabet, or more exactly the elementary sound for which it stands [2]. It is expressly distinguished from the syllable, because the latter can be broken up into diverse elements. Sometimes by metonymy the elements or ultimate parts of things in general [3], or of a discourse [4], or of a state [5], are called στοιχεῖα. Similarly by metonymy the term στοιχεῖον is applied to a genus because it has one definition [6], or anything that is small, simple, and indivisible, is called στοιχεῖον [7].

---

1. " Assembl. " 652 : ὅταν ᾖ δεκάπουν τὸ στοιχειον.
2. Plato : *Crat.* 422A ; *Polit.* 277 e ; Plut. *Quaest. conv.* IX, Prob. 3^{1}. Philo : *Opif. mund.* 127 (42) ; Dion. Hal. *De comp. verb.* 14 ; Aristot. *Metaph.* 6. 17^{12} (1041 b ^{31}) ; *Poet.* 20. 1 ff. (1456 b $^{20ff.}$) ; *Categ.* 9(12). 3(14a $^{39ff.}$).
3. Xen. *Mem.* 2. 1^{1} ; Plato : *Polit.* 278c.
4. Aristot. *Rhet.* 1. 6^{1} (1362 a ^{21}) ; 2. 22^{13} (1396 b ^{21}, ^{22}).
5. Aristot. *Pol.* 5. 9^{5} (1309 b ^{16}) ; *Isoc.* 18 a (2^{16}).
6. Aristot. *Metaph.* 4. 3^{5} (1014 b ^{9}).
7. Aristot. *Metaph.* 4. 3^{4} (1014 b ^{3}).

(3) One of the component parts of physical bodies [1], or the four elements, namely earth, water, air, and fire [2].

(4) A premise or fundamental proposition of a demonstration [3]; it was in this sense that the term was applied by later writers to the work of Euclid on mathematics and to that of Archimedes.

(5) The usage of the term to designate the letters of the alphabet gave rise to a metamorphical acceptation of the term in virtue of which the στοιχεῖα were the rudiments, the first-principles, the ABC as it were, of a science or art. This signification was common in New Testament times when στοιχεῖουν meant " to teach the rudiments ", and στοιχείωσις " instruction ", " education. "[4]

(6) Later on under the influence of the Stoic and Pythagorean schools, the custom arose to designate the seven planets by the seven vowels of the Greek alphabet and to call them τὰ στοιχεῖα οὐρανία, a designation which was later extended to all the constellations and twelve signs of the zodiac [5]. But since we have no definite example of this usage until the close of the second century, it is not certain that this use of the term goes back to the beginning of the Christian era.

(7) Finally, the term στοιχεῖον came also to designate

---

1. Empedocles employed the term ῥιζώματα and Anaxagoras σπέρματα, though ARISTOT. *Metaph.* I. 4^{6} (985 a^{32}); 2. 3^{2} (998 a^{28}), ascribes the use of στοιχεῖον to Empedocles, and Diogenes Laertius II 1^{1}; IX 3^{2}, employs it in speaking of the views of other pre-Socratic philosophers. Plato employs the term στοιχεῖον because ῥιζώματα was foreign to the Attic; *Sophist.* 252 B, *Tim.* 48 B, *Theaet.* 201 E; cf. also ARISTOT. *Meteor.* I. 1^{1} (338 a^{22}).

2. DIOG. LAERT. VII, $1^{68ff.}$ (134 ff.), III, 1^{19} (24), V 1^{13} (32), VIII, 2^{12} (76), IX, 3^{2} (21); EPICT. *Diss.* 3, ^{13}, ^{14}; PLUT. *Aristid.* 6^{4}; HERM. *Vis* 3. 13^{3}; Just. Mart. *Dial.* 62^{2}; ATHEN. 22^{1}, ^{8}; PHILO: *Quis rer. div.* 197 (41); *Wisdom* 7^{17}, 19^{18}; 4 Mac. 12^{13}; cf. also PLUT. *Quest. conv.* VIII, *Prob.* 8^{2}; PHILO: *Opif. mund.* (131) 45; *Orac. Sib.* 2^{206}.

3. ARISTOT. *Metaph.* 2. $3^{2ff.}$ (998 a^{26}): καὶ τῶν διαγραμμάτων ταῦτα στοιχεῖα λέγομεν ὧν αἱ ἀποδείξεις ἐνυπάρχουσιν; cf. also *Metaph.* 4. $3^{2ff.}$ (1014 a^{35}); PLUT. *Marcell.* 17^{5}. In ARISTOT. *Topica* 8, 3^{6} (158 b^{35}), 8. 14 $(12)^{8}$ (163 b^{24}), *Cat.* 9 $(12)^{4}$ (14 a^{39}) στοιχεῖον is applied to a line or circle.

4. HORACE, *Sat.* I, 1^{20}; *Hebr.* V, 12; Isoc. 18a (2^{16}); PLATO, *Legg.* VII, 790C; ARISTOT. *Metaph.* 4. 3^{2} (1014 a^{35}); PLUT. *Lib. ed.* 16; CORNUT. 14; XEN. *Mem.* 2. 1^{1}; cf. also ARISTOT. *Metaph.* 2. $3^{2ff.}$ (998 $a^{23ff.}$), 6. 17^{12} (1014 b^{31}), 12. 10 (1086 b); *Categ.* 9(12) ^{4}(14 $a^{39ff.}$); PLUT. *Com. not.* 48, 49.

5. DIOG. LAERT. VI, 9^{2} (102); JUST. MART. *Trypho*, 23^{3}, *Apol.* II, 5^{2}, *Epist. ad Diog.* 7^{2}; THEOPH. *ad Autol.* 1^{4}; ARISTIDES, *Apol.* III-V; EUSEBIUS, *Hist. eccl.* III, 21, V, 24; JEROME, *Epist.* CXX, 4. For the above references cf. BURTON, O. C., p. 510 ff., PRAT, O. C., vol. II^{6}, p. 503 ff.

a spirit or demon. However we have no define evidence that στοιχεῖον meant " spirit ", " angel ", or " demon ", earlier than *Test. Sal.* 34, which in its present form is post-Christian, and may not be earlier than the third or fourth century [1].

In conclusion it may be noted that in those examples and usages which we have quoted above and which can be of value to us in our study, στοιχεῖον retains throughout the same essential signification : it designates something that is " basic ", " elementary ", " rudimentary ".

B. As to the other term, κόσμος, this is of more frequent occurrence in the Pauline Epistles than the former, and its meaning can consequently be more easily determined. In the first place, κόσμος designates the universe, the *ensemble* of material creation (Rom. I, 20 ; Eph. I, 14). Again, the Apostle uses κόσμος to denote the earth as the abode of man or more generally as the scene of human activity (I Cor. V, 10 ; I Tim. VI, 7, III, 16 ; Eph. II, 12 ; Col. I, 6). Frequently, however, κόσμος, refers not the terrestrial globe but to the inhabitants of the earth, to the human race itself (Rom. III, 6 ; III, 19 ; V, 12 ; I Cor. IV, 13 ; II Cor. I, 12). Finally, κόσμος, whether it be considered as the abode of man or as the whole of humanity acquires a pejorative sense in virtue of an explicit or implied contrast with a superior world or with a regenerate humanity ; it is the natural world, unregenerate, and destitute of divine grace, as opposed to the supernatural world (I Cor. I, 27, 28, II, 12, III, 19, VII, 31-34 ; Gal. VI, 14) [2].

After these preliminary considerations we may now proceed to examine the whole expression, τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου, in the Pauline Epistles.

II. Τὰ Στοιχεῖα τοῦ Κόσμου IN THE EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS.

The expression, τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου, occurs twice in the Galatian Epistle : IV, 3 : οὕτως καὶ ἡμεῖς ὅτε ἦμεν νήποι ὑπὸ τὰ

1. As is evident from modern Greek usage στοιχεῖον did eventually come to mean an " angel " or " spirit ". But what is not clear is whether this usage belongs to the first century A. D. That the Jewish writers ascribed a spirit or angel to various physical objects is clear from I Enoch $6o^{11-21}$, Jub. $2^{2ff.}$. but not that they were called στοιχεῖα. The value of II Enoch 16^{7}, 12^{1}, 15^{1} and of Tatian, *Oratio ad Graecos*, c. 12, remains doubtful as far as the meaning of στοιχεῖον is concerned.

2. Cf. PRAT, o. c., vol. II[6], pp. 505-507.

στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου ἤμεθα δεδουλωμένοι, and IV, 9 : νῦν δὲ γνόντες θεὸν, μᾶλλον δέ γνωσθέντες ὑπὸ θεοῦ, πῶς επιστρέφετε πάλιν ἐπὶ τὰ ἀσθενῆ καὶ πτωχα στοιχεῖα οἷς πάλιν ἄνωθεν δουλεῦσαι θέλετε. In the first place, we cannot agree with Cornely [1] that the reference of ἡμεῖς in IV, 3 is to the Jews alone. That it refers to the latter is indeed clear from III, 24 : ὁ νόμος παιδαγωγὸς ἡμῶν γέγονεν and from III, 23 : ὑπὸ νόμον ἐφρουρούμεθα συγκλειόμενοι. But it cannot be proved from Rom. IX, 4 and XV, 8 that carnal descent gave any right to the inheritance, for this belongs to faith : " the justice of God, by faith of Jesus Christ, unto all and upon all them that believe in him, for there is no distinction " (Rom. III, 22). The Jews therefore as descendants of Abraham, had no right but only a priority because of the promises made to their fathers. That ἡμεῖς of IV, 3, refers also to the Gentiles is clear from the context. This is evident in the first place by the successive changes in the mode of address which Saint Paul employs when speaking of our sonship in Christ ; after having said that " God sent His Son, made under the law, that He might redeem them who were under the law (IV, 4, 5), the Apostle continues " that *we* (all Christians, far and wide, Jews and Gentiles) might receive the adoption of sons. And because *you* (my Galatian converts) are sons... therefore now *he* (each individual man who hears my words) is not a servant but a son " (IV, 5, 6, 7). When Christ redeemed " those who were under the law " from the Mosaic prescriptions and from all positive ordinances, not only the Jews but also the Gentiles (and the Galatian converts were mostly Gentiles) received the adoption of sons. Again, if we make ἡμεῖς of IV, 3 refer also to the Gentiles, we can easily explain IV, 8 : " But *then*, indeed, not knowing God, you served them who by nature are not gods " (ἀλλα τότε μὲν οὐκ εἰδότες θεὸν). Τότε thus refers to the time when the Galatian Gentiles " were serving under the elements of the world " ; otherwise, it would have no definite reference. But especially unless we admit this reference of ἡμεῖς in IV, 3 how explain the return and retrogression of the Galatians to serve anew the " weak and beggarly elements " as stated in IV, 9 : But *now*, after that you have known God, or rather are known by God, how turn you *again* to the weak and needy elements, which you desire to serve *again ?* " In

1. *Epistola secunda ad Corinthios et ad Galatas*, p. 523.

IV, 4-7 the reference is to both Jews and Gentiles while in IV, 8-10 the reference is to the Gentiles alone, a fact which clearly determines the extension of ἡμεῖς in IV, 3, since in both of these sections Saint Paul is speaking of the liberation (IV, 5, 9) of those (ἡμεῖς) who " were serving under the elements of the world " [1].

The above discussion already gives us some indications as to the possible meaning which we are to attribute to the στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου. Speaking of our liberation from the " elements of the world ", Saint Paul says in IV, 4 : " But when the fulness of time was come, God sent His Son, made of a woman, made under the law, that he might redeem them who were under the law ". That the phrase " those who were under the law " (ὑπὸ νόμον) refers primarily to the Jews and to the Mosaic Law is clear. Nevertheless, as said above, v. 5 and vv. 4-7 refer not only to the Jews but also to the Gentiles. Hence while τοὺς ὑπὸ νόμον (not ὑπὸ τὸν νόμον) refers primarily to the Mosaic Law as the highest and most rigorous form of law, the application is to be extended at the same time to all those subject to any system of positive ordinances. So that the Gentile converts of Galatia in so far as they are regarded as having undergone a discipline up to a certain point analogous to that of the Jews are to be classed with those ὑπὸ νόμον.

Here, some one might object, and not without reason, to Saint Paul's placing in the same category the divinely ordained Law (Rom. VII, 12) and the degraded heathen systems. In answer it must be said that as viewed in their spiritual aspect there can be no comparison between the one and the other. The pagan religions, outside of that sense of dependence on God which they could not wholly crush (Acts XIV, 17 ; XVII, 23, 27, 28 ; Rom. I, 19), were wholly bad, while in the Mosaic Law the spiritual element was truly divine. But it is in regard to the ritualistic element, which in Judaism was as much lower than its spiritual element as in heathenism it was higher, that the two systems approach within such a distance that they

1. To say as does FERRARI, *L'uomo irredento in san Paolo*, p. 185, that Saint Paul " parlando degli elementi del mondo ai gentili cristiani, non alludeva a qualche cosa di anteriore alla loro conversione, bensí a qualche cosa di posteriore nella quale minacciavano di cadere ", is to deprive the Apostle's statements of all coherency and consistency.

can under certain limitations be classed together. For when Christianity came, it absorbed whatever was spiritual in its predecessor so that the Mosaic dispensation, deprived of this higher element, became a mere mass of lifeless ordinances, differing only in degree not in kind from any other ritualistic system. Indeed, the ritual of Moses, at the time the Apostle wrote, was a thing of the past. It had been instituted for a peculiar purpose, as " a shadow of things to come ", but now that the substance, the blessings of which the ritual was the shadow, had been brought in by Christ, its purpose was fulfilled and its work was done. Henceforth it became a worthless system, yea, it became positively hurtful to those who would rely on it as on an instrument of salvation.

Hence Saint Paul says that a relapse into Judaism on the part of the Gentiles can be regarded as a relapse into the position of unconverted heathenism. In Gal. IV, 10, using more general terms than in Col. II, 16, in order that these might at once apply to both Judaism and heathenism, the Apostle describes the adoption of Jewish ritualism on the part of his Galatian converts as a return to the weak and beggarly discipline of childhood from which they had been emancipated when they abandoned that worship. For the Jewish and heathen ritualism had this in common that both were made up of precepts and ordinances, both were formal and external in their character, both represented " law " as opposed to " grace ", and both were adopted to a state not of manhood but of spiritual infancy and nonage. Before proceeding to determine further the precise meaning of the στοιχεῖα, let us turn to a consideration of the passages in the Colossian Epistle.

III. Τὰ Στοιχεῖα τοῦ Κόσμου IN THE EPISTLE TO THE COLOSSIANS.

From the Epistle addressed by Saint Paul to the church of Colossae we can infer the presence of two currents of thought which threatened the purity of the Christian faith in this community. A mere glance at the language of the Epistle enables us to detect in the teaching which the Apostle combats the presence of Judaism. The observance of sabbaths and

new-moons, the distinction of meats and drinks, circumcision, etc., all point in this direction. Yet on closer examination it is clear that the Judaic elements do not exhaust the heresy or heresies against which the Epistle is directed. We can also discern in the false teaching which prevailed at Colossae a gnostic element, an element of theosophic speculation and certain shadowy mysticism as well as a tendency to interpose certain intermediate agencies between God and man (Col. II, 16, 17, 21 ; II, 4, 8, 18, 23) [1].

In truth, the two elements are so closely connected in the Apostle's refutation, a fact, which is important for our proper understanding of the στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου, that it is impossible to separate them. He passes backwards and forwards from the one to the other in such a way as to show that they are only parts of one complex whole. Thus the Apostle says : " Beware lest any man cheat you by philosophy and vain deceit, according to the tradition of men, according to the elements of the world (II, 8),... you are circumcised with circumcision not made by hand (II, 11)... and you... he hath quickened... blotting out the hand writing of the decree that was against us... despoiling the principalities and powers (II, 13-15),... Let no man therefore judge you in meat or in drink, or in respect of a festival day, or of a new-moon, or of the sabbath (II, 16)... Let no man seduce you willingly in humility in the religion of angels... if then you be dead with Christ from the elements of this world, why are you subject to ordinances " (II, 20) ? From these passages it is clear that the gnostic speculative element and the Jewish practical element are regarded as intimately intertwined in their growth.

Because of the importance which this subject will have in our attempt to determine the exact meaning of τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου, we feel obliged to speak more at length on the situation in the church at Colossae. Who, it might be asked, were these false teachers of Colossae ? The most probable solution seems to be that they were Gnostic Essenes, for it is among the Essenes that we find before and about this time certain special tendencies of thought such as would prepare

1. Cf. LIGHTFOOT, *Colossians and Philemon*, pp. 1-72, 73-113, 349, 419, where the reader will also find copious historical references on the subject, especially to Josephus and Philo.

the way for a combination like that found in the Christian community of Colossae. The Essene, according to the delineations of ancient writers, especially of Philo and Josephus, was exceptionally rigorous in his observance of the Mosaic ritual. In fact, he went beyond the Pharisee in that he would drink no wine nor touch animal food, and especially in that he added to Mosaic legalism a certain gnostic, mystic speculation, and rigid asceticism. Like the Gnostics this Jewish sect exhibits the same exclusiveness in the communication of its doctrines. Its theological speculations take the same direction, dwelling on the mysteries of creation, regarding matter as the abode of evil, and postulating certain spiritual agencies as necessary links between heaven and earth.

That this type of Jewish thought and practise had established itself in the Apostolic age in those parts of Asia Minor with which we are more directly concerned, we have sufficient proof, especially if this evidence be viewed in the light of what Josephus and Philo tell us concerning the Essenes. Moreover, we find that the Christian heresies of the next succeeding ages exhibit in a more developed form the same complex type which here appears in its nascent state ; this later development, especially the heresy of Cerinthus, shows that the combination was not only historically possible in itself, but likewise presupposes some earlier stage of its existence such as confronts us at Colossae.

That Saint Paul is struggling against this Gnostic Judaism is evident from a perusal of the Colossian Epistle. Against the intellectual exclusiveness of Christian Essenism, he defends the universality of the Gospel, and emphatically reiterates : " We preach, admonishing *every* man, and teaching *every* man, in *all* wisdom, that we may present *every* man perfect in Christ Jesus " (I, 28 ; III, 11, 16). Against the philosophy of successive evolutions from the Divine Nature, angelic mediators forming the successive links in the chain which binds the finite to the Infinite, Saint Paul sets the doctrine of the one Eternal Son, the Image of God, begotten before the world, whose power is supreme in both the natural and the spiritual creation (I, 15-20 ; II, 9-15), and in Whom the fulness of the Godhead dwells corporeally (II, 9). And against rigid ascetism he sets the only and true remedy of sin, — the elevation of the inner life in Christ (III, 1, 2, 5, 10).

With these preliminary remarks on the circumstances of the Colossian Epistle, we may now proceed to an examination of the στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου, namely, in II, 8 : Βλέπετε μή τις ὑμᾶς ἔσται ὁ συλαγωγῶν διὰ τῆς φιλοσοφίας καὶ κενῆς ἀπάτης κατὰ τὴν παραδόσιν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, κατὰ τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου καὶ οὐκ κατὰ Χρίστον, and in II, 20 : Εἰ ἀπεθάνετε σὺν Χριστῷ ἀπὸ τῶν στοιχείων τοῦ κόσμου, τί ὡς ζῶντες ἐν κόσμῳ δογματίζεσθε. Flinging back at them a favorite term of their own, Saint Paul in II, 8 calls the mystic cosmogony and angelology of the false teachers of Colossae a " hollow and misleading philosophy ". Referring to the twofold origin of their teaching, the Apostle, in the first place, aptly says that it was " according to the traditions of men ", for their doctrines were essentially esoteric and traditional. The Essenes, their spiritual predecessors, as well as the Gnostics claimed to possess such a source of knowledge. The oath which was taken by the full members of the former sect bound them not to communicate their doctrines to anyone otherwise as he himself had received them, and further to guard carefully the books of their society and the names of angels [1].

Secondly, Saint Paul says that the teaching of his opponents was κατὰ τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου. This expression of itself in II, 8 could give us little information did we not possess the incidental remarks which the Apostle makes in regard to the same " elements of the world " in II, 20. In v. 20 Saint Paul demands of the Colossians that if they died unto the " elements of the world " when they were baptized into Christ, why were they again allowing themselves to be overriden with ordinances. And what were these precepts ? The Apostle himself disparagingly repeats the prohibitions of the false teachers in their own words : " touch not, taste not, handle not " (μὴ ἅψῃ, μηδὲ γεύσῃ, μηδὲ θίγῃς Col. II, 21). Hence the meaning of τὰ στοιχεῖα becomes clear. The chief anxiety of the Gnostic was to escape from the infection of evil by escaping from the domination of matter. This tendency appears plainly also in the Colossian Epistle. Though the prohibitions to which the Apostle alludes might be explained in part by the ordinances of the Mosaic ritual, this explanation will not cover all the points. Thus, for

1. LIGHTFOOT, o. c., p. 90 ; cf. also KNABENBAUER, *Epistola ad Ephesios, Philippenses, et Colossenses*, p. 323, ABBOTT, *Ephesians and Colossians*, p. 246.

instance, drinks are mentioned as well as meats (II, 16), though on the former the Mosaic Law is silent. So too the rigorous enactement " touch not, taste not, handle not ", seems to go far beyond the Levitical legislation.

The above study of the different passages in their context has already given us some indications as to the meaning of the στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου. The full signification of the expression will become evident from a comparative examination of the passages.

IV. COMPARISON, RÉSUMÉ, AND CONCLUSIONS.

By comparing now the passages of Colossians (II, 8, 20) with those of Galatians (IV, 3, 9) we can easily determine the precise reference and signification of τὰ στοιχεῖα κόσμου.

In the first place, that the Mosaic Law is included under τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου is plainly evident from Gal. IV, 9. Since Saint Paul, however, was not speaking solely of the Jews but also of the Gentiles he had to choose an expression which would fit the religious principles and practises of both. Contrary to the opinion of Ferrari [1], the expression, " elements of the world ", as opposed to Christianity, could well be applied to a law even of divine origin, but which was only provisional [2], which Saint Paul compared to a pedagogue, which had reference to an unregenerate world destitute of divine grace, and which insisted especially on temporal recompenses for the Jewish nation.

In Col. II, 8 the rite of circumcision is especially singled out as comprised under the στοιχεῖα. In this passage, as said above, the Apostle distinguishes the speculative element in the teaching of the false doctors, namely the mystic, gnostic speculation, and the practical element which included ritual precepts of the Mosaic Law and certain ascetical observances. Against the former he sets the πλήρωμα τῆς θεότητος σωματικῶς ἐν

1. O. c., p. 184.

2. Says Saint Thomas *ad Galatas* ad h. l. *(In omnes s. Pauli epistolas commentaria,* Ed. Taurinensis[5], vol. I, p. 567) : " Lex vetus dicitur elementum, quia sicut pueris, qui sunt instituendi ad scientiam, primo proponuntur elementa illius scientiae, per quae manuducuntur ad illam scientiam : ita lex vetus proposita est Judaeis, per quam manuducerentur ad fidem et justitiam ".

Χριστῳ, while against the practical error, against the attempted enforcement of the initiary rite of Judaism, Saint Paul recommends a spiritual circumcision, which is not external but inward, which divests not only of a part of the flesh but of the whole body of carnal desires, and which is not of Moses but of Christ (II, 11 ff.).

In Gal. IV, 10 the στοιχεῖα are associated with certain Jewish observances, which are analogous to those which the Galatians observed as pagans before their conversion. Since in Galatians Saint Paul is speaking of both Jews and Gentiles he says in a general way : " You observe days, and months, and times, and years " (ἡμέρας παρατηρεῖσθε καὶ μῆνας καὶ καιροὺς καὶ ἐνιαυτούς), while in Col. II, 16 he says more specifically : " Let no man therefore judge you... in respect of a festival day, or of the new moon, or of the sabbaths " (Μὴ οὖν τις ὑμᾶς κρινέτω ἐν... μέρει ἑορτῆς ἢ νεομηνίας ἢ σαββάτων). The ἡμέραι in Gal. IV, 10 are the days recurring weekly, the sabbaths ; μῆνες, the monthly celebrations, the new moons ; καιροί, the annual festivals, as the passover, pentecost, and feast of the tabernacles ; and ἐνιαυτοί, the sacred years, as the sabbatical year and the year of jubilee. The first three words of Gal. IV, 10 correspond to the three words used in Col. II, 16, except that the order is reversed and that in Col. II, 19 the designations are more precise.

A further determination of the στοιχεῖα is found in Col. II, 21, where Saint Paul enumerates certain practises which the Colossians wished to adopt although they had been liberated from them (II, 12, 14, 20) : " Touch not, taste not, handle not ". These prohibitions relate to the defilement contracted in diverse ways by contact with impure objects. Some were doubtless reenactments of the Mosaic Law, while others would be exaggerations or additions of rigorous asceticism such as we find among the Essene prototypes of these Colossian heretics, e. g., the avoidance of oils and wines, the shunning of contact with a stranger or religious inferior, etc.

Col. II, 21 is further explained by II, 16 where Saint Paul tells the Colossians that if Christ freed them from the Mosaic Law no one had a right to take them to task for not observing the Jewish laws concerning the choice of food and drink. The ordinances of the Mosaic Law applied primarily to meats. They contained no prohibitions concerning drinks except in a very

few cases, e. g. in regard to priests ministering in the tabernacle (Lev. x, 9), in regard to liquids contained in unclean vessels (Lev. xi, 34, 36), and in regard to Nazarite vows (Num. v, 3). These directions taken in connexion with the rigid observances which the later Jews had grafted on them would be sufficient to explain the expression when applied to the Mosaic Law by itself as in Heb. ix, 10. But the rigor of the Colossian false teachers, like that of their Jewish prototypes, the Essenes, doubtless went far beyond the injunctions of the Law. It is probable that they forbade wine and animal food altogether.

Mosaic prescriptions, some of which found an analogue among the heathen practises of the unconverted Galatians, while some others were very much exaggerated by the Gnostic Essenes of Colossae, — these in the last resort are the στοιχεῖα. In as much as these ordinances belonged to the external, material, and unregenerated world, Saint Paul fitly qualifies them as being τοῦ κόσμου. Besides, in Gal. iv, 9 the Apostle says that the στοιχεῖα were " weak " (ἀσθενῆ) because " they had no power to sanctify the sinner before God ; no power to rescue him from condemnation ; no power to secure within him the fulfilment of righteousness ; they could not deliver him from the wrath of God, or from the love of sin ; they could not procure for him either pardon or holiness ; they could point, indeed, to One who could save, but for any saving purpose they were in themselves altogether powerless " [1]. So too in Col. ii, 20-23, where there is question of other ordinances classed under the στοιχεῖα, Saint Paul similarly says that all such teaching while it may have a show of wisdom, an officious parade of religious devotion, an affectation of humility, and treat the body with merciless rigor, has nothing of real value to check the desires of the flesh. Again, in Gal. iv, 9 the Apostle says that the στοιχεῖα were " poor ", " needy ", " beggarly " ; they were poor " as contrasted with the unsearchable riches that are in Christ ; poor as bringing with them no rich endowment of spiritual treasures ; poor, as dealing with the surface of the soul, but having nothing in them with which to satisfy its deepest wants ; poor, as making much fair show and promise of good, but leaving their most zealous votaries beggars as regards all the real graces of the Christian character " [2]. And

1. Bayley, *A Commentary on St. Paul s Epistle to the Galatians*, pp. 276-277.
2. Ibid., p. 277.

the Apostle again says in Col. II, 17 that the στοιχεῖα were " a shadow of things to come, but the body is of Christ ".

And here, we think, we come to the fundamental meaning of στοιχεῖον as described above, especially under (5), namely, " rudimentary teaching ". The Mosaic Law was a rudimentary institution, the alphabet as it were of spiritual and moral instruction (cf. Gal. III, 24). The chosen race like the individual man had its period of childhood, during which time the mode of instruction was tempered to its undeveloped capacities (Gal. IV, 1-3). But when Christ came, the Law became a mass of lifeless ordinances, a mere human tradition. Like Judaism so too heathenism, considered as a ritual system made up of ordinances and precepts, prepared humanity during its spiritual infancy for that more elevated, more virile, and more divine teaching which appeared with Christ. These ceremonial laws of both Jews and Gentiles had reference especially to material things ; they had to do with foods and drinks, with festivals whose time was governed by the heavenly bodies, with lustrations, purifications, circumcision, sacrifices, etc., all of which pertained to unregenerate mankind destitute of divine grace. Hence the expression, τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου may be said to designate rudimentary religious teaching of the human race pertaining to the external unregenerate world [1].

V. MODERN THEORIES CONCERNING Τα Στοιχεῖα τοῦ Κόσμου.

A. According to Kurze and Ferrari [3] the στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου are the physical elements of the world viewed from a religious and ethical aspect. But if this be the meaning of στοιχεῖα it can with difficulty be applied to *all* the Pauline passages. The mention or days, months, and years, in Gal. IV, 10, it is true, suggests the possibility of a reference to the heavenly bodies by whose movements the recurrence of these periods is fixed. So too the mention of meat and drink in

1. Cf. LAGRANGE, *Épître aux Galates*, pp. 98 ff., 107 ff., PRAT, o. c., vol. II[6], pp. 125-129, 507-509.

2. O. c., p. 137 : " Die στοιχεῖα sind keine Geistwesen. Es sind die unter religiös-ethischen Gesichtspunkten betrachteten Grundstoffe der Welt ".

3. O. c., p. 184 : " Paolo allude realmente agli elementi materiali del mondo, in quanto però essí, per la Legge mosaìca prendono caratteri religiosi, qualità morali, valore legale ".

Col. II, 8, 20 suggests a possible reference of στοιχεῖα to the material elements of the world. But this latter explanation will with difficulty apply to Gal. IV, 3, 9, as the planetary system will not apply to Col. II, 8, 20. The element that is common to both is that the στοιχεῖα represent an imperfect type of teaching, in Galatians described as temporary and abolished by the coming of Christ, in Colossians as proceeding from men (II, 8), and also as temporary and ended in Christ (II, 14, 17). Again, the adjectives ἀσθενῆ and πτωχά have no appropriateness when applied to the heavenly bodies, and but little with reference to the physical elements of the universe, but aptly describe the elements of an imperfect religious system as compared with the full truth of the revelation in Christ. Finally, the things which Saint Paul was dissuading the Galatians from accepting were requirements of the Law, as those from which he dissuaded the Colossians were dogmas of religion urged in the name of Judaism or some system of kindred spirit.

B. Many modern authors and the majority of German theologians maintain that the στοιχεῖα are spiritual personal beings, the elemental spirits *(Elementargeister)*. This theory is defended by Thayer [1], Massic [2], Jones [3], Dibelius [4], Everling [5], Deissmann [6], Bousset [7], Lietzmann [8], Knabenbauer [9], and Protin [10]. The initiator of this exegesis was perhaps Ritschl [11] who saw in the στοιχεῖα the angel-promulgators of the Law. The exponents of this view maintain that a study of later Jewish theology shows that it was not the heavenly bodies and the stars in particular that were supposed to have their special angels, but that behind all the phenomena of the material universe there stood the elemental spirits animating them and guiding their movements (animism). It is

1. Art. *Elements*, SDB, p. 206.
2. Art. *Elements*, HDB, vol. I, pp. 682-683.
3. Art. *St. Paul and the Angels*, Exp. May 1918, p. 414 ff.
4. O. c., p. 78 ff.
5. O. c., p. 55.
6. Art. *Elements*, EBi, vol. II, p. 1259.
7. *Die Religion des Judentums*[2], p. 372.
8. *An die Galater*, p. 247.
9. *Epistolas ad Ephesios, Philippenses, et Colossenses*, p. 324.
10. Art. *Les éléments du monde dans la pensée de s. Paul*, RAug., 1909, vol. XIV, pp. 71-74.
11. *Rechtfertigung und Versöhnung*[4], vol. II, p. 252.

probable then that this is what Saint Paul had in view when he speaks of the first age as being in bondage to the " elements of the world ". For the Apostle the whole world, the Jewish with its Law and its angels, and the Gentiles with its astral religions, is a world in bondage.

Furthermore, it is urged that the context obliges us to attribute to the στοιχεῖα a *personal* sense. The reasons that are usually advanced are the following : first, the στοιχεῖα are everywhere opposed to personal beings, in Galatians to the ἐπίτροποι and οἰκόνομοι, and in Colossians to Χριστός ; second, the adjectives πτωχὰ καὶ ἀσθενῆ are more appropriately applied to personal beings ; third, in the same context where Saint Paul speaks of the στοιχεῖα he also speaks of ἄγγελοι (Gal. III, 19 ; Col. II, 18) and of ἄρχαι and ἐξουσιαί (Col. II, 10, 15), hence the στοιχεῖα and ἄγγελοι are similar ; finally, astral spirits are especially suggested by Gal. IV, 10, and Col. II, 16.

But the above arguments are far from being peremptory. In the first place there is obviously no necessity to make οἰκονόμοι and στοιχεῖα both personal in the comparison, any more than there is to give νόμος a personal sense when it is likened to a παιδαγώγος (Gal. III, 24). The argument drawn from the use of the adjectives πτωχὰ and ἀσθενῆ is not of much force ; thus the fact that in Rom. VIII, 3 the Apostle characterizes the Law as " weak " does not make the Law a person (cf. also Heb. VII, 18 ; Rom. XVI, 18). The identification of the στοιχεῖα with the ἄρχαι, etc., is inadmissible, for Saint Paul never characterizes the spirit powers as elemental spirits ; moreover, in that case, why did not Saint Paul use directly the term θρόνοι, ἄρχαι, or ἄγγελοι ?

It is also maintained by some that the στοιχεῖα which the Galatians desire again to serve are equivalent to οἱ φύσει μὴ ὄντες θεοί to whom formerly they were in bondage. But there is not the slightest indication in the Epistle of any propensity on the part of the Galatian converts to fall back into idolatry, for the Apostle, who opposed so vehemently the practices of the Judaizers, would certainly have reproved them for so grave a fault ; besides, he expressly says in what this retrogression consisted : " You observe days and months and times and years " (IV, 10), i. e., you subject yourself to Mosaic or similar prescriptions.

That στοιχεῖον did eventually come to mean " angel " or

" spirit " is evident from modern Greek usage. However we have no definite example of this use earlier than the *Testament of Solomon*, which in its present form is post-Christian, and may not be earlier than the third or fourth century. That Jewish writers ascribed a spirit or angel to various physical objects is clear from I Enoch 60^{11-12} and Jub. $2^{2ff.}$ but not that they were called στοιχεῖα. Furthermore, how according to this interpretation explain the term κόσμος ? Does Saint Paul ever use the term in such a sense that the proponents of this theory can legimately claim it to defend their views ?

The στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου are therefore neither the physical elements of the universe nor elemental spirits. An interpretation which is best adapted to the context and to Pauline usage is that which understands the στοιχεῖα to refer to the rudimentary religious instruction of the human race. We shall now see how the Mosaic Law which is also to be classed under στοιχεῖα served as an auxiliary of Sin. Because of the place of prominence and importance which the Law holds in the Pauline Epistles, we shall correspondingly give it due and proportionate consideration in our study.

Art. III. — THE MOSAIC LAW.

I. Occasion of Saint Paul's discussion of the Law.

After the two warm and enthusiastic welcomes which the Galatians accorded to Saint Paul when they received him as an " angel of God " and would have plucked out their eyes for him (Gal. IV, 13 ; I, 9 ; V, 3 ; IV, 14, 15), the Apostle little expected that his beloved converts would so easily relapse from his own teaching into the shallowest ceremonialism of the Judaizers [1].

1. The Jewish converts may be conveniently though not rigidly divided into the following categories : a) *the Jewish Christians of Jerusalem*, having James as their leader, who were fully convinced that the Gentiles could be saved without observing the Law of Moses. From this premise they could easily and logically deduce the conclusion that the Law was likewise no longer a principle of salvation for the Jews themselves. But as far as the Gentiles were concerned, James and his followers did not impose the Law even as a means of higher perfection. James remained in communion with Paul, who in turn showed him the greatest deference; b) *Pharisaic Judaizers*, ardent zealots of the Law opposed to any external influence whether philosophic or religious, who wished to impose the Law upon the Gentiles as a

But his opponents, the Pharisaic Christians of Jerusalem, were never at rest. They had already intruded themselves into Antioch and Corinth, and during his second visit to Galatia Saint Paul noticed that there also the atmosphere was beginning to be infected with the germs of their discussions and controversies (Gal. I, 9; V, 3). These Judaizing Pharisees endangered the whole future of Christianity by trying to turn it from the freedom of a universal Gospel into the bondage of a Judaic law, and to construct a hedge which at the cost of a cutting in the flesh should exclude the noblest of the Gentiles while it admitted the vilest of the Jews, " except you be circumcised after the manner of Moses, you cannot be saved " (Acts XV, 1). To the Galatians they offered an external cult fascinatingly resembling their own pagan ceremonial and far more easy than a spiritual religion. Hence Saint Paul, vexed at the fickleness of his Galatian converts and stung with righteous indignation, seized his pen to express in the most unmistakable language his teaching concerning the falsity and worthlessness of the limits into which these Christian Pharisees wished to compress the principles of Christianity.

These Judaizers, who manipulated and evaded the Law to which they professed obedience, made use of the basest of controversial weapons, — surreptitious sneers, personal slanders, and systematic disparagements of the Apostle's authority. Saint Paul, they maintained, was a renegade from the Rabbis, his teaching was a daring apostasy from the oral and even written law and a revolt against the fathers and Moses himself. On the other hand, they said, he was only a nominal Christian and not an Apostle ; he certainly was not one of the Twelve ; he was not instructed by Jesus, nor had he seen Him except in a vision and therefore lacked one of the essentials of the apostolate (I Cor. IX, 1) ; all that he knew of Christianity he had learned at Jerusalem, and that he had wilfully perverted, and hence his gospel was not the real gospel (Gal. I, 11) ; he was in opposition to the heads, the " pillars " of the Church

---

necessary condition of salvation. It is this class of Judaizers that Saint Paul combats in his epistle to the Galatians ; c) *Gnostic Judaizers* who, while they boasted of their fidelity to the Law, inculcated certain precepts foreign to it (Rom. 14 ; Col. II 16). Cf. BOYSSON, *La foi et la loi* pp. 29-150, PRAT o. c., vol. I[9], p. 191 ff., also art. *Judaisants*, VDB, vol. III, pp. 1778-1783, LIGHTFOOT, *St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians*, p. 292 ff.

of Jerusalem (Gal. II, 2-10), and in his teaching shifting and inconsistent in order to please men (Gal. I, 10, 11).

Nevertheless, they did not condemn absolutely everything that the Apostle preached. No one, they said, would think of effacing Jesus Christ from the hearts of the faithful converts. The Messias was indeed the heir of the promises made to Abraham. But since these promises were not reserved exclusively to Abraham's carnal descendants, the role of Christ was to associate the Gentiles in the salvation promised to Israel. Before anyone can pretend to share in the Messianic blessings, he must first be initiated into Israel by a spiritual bond, by circumcision, which God Himself instituted to distinguish His own chosen people. For was not circumcision the very badge of Jewish nationality, the very nucleus of Jewish ceremonialism? Was it not given as a seal of the Covenant to Abraham ? Did not Joseph see that it was duly performed in Egypt, did not Moses insist upon it in Midian, and did not Josue renew it in Canaan ? Was there ever a king or a prophet who had not been circumcised, and above all did not Jesus Christ Himself submit to circumcision ? Who then could arbitrarily dare to set aside the commandment of the holy and inspired Law [1] ?

Furthermore, Abraham whose works were pleasing and agreeable to God was the type of the just man. Justice and righteousness without which no one can enter the kingdom of God has its code of laws promulgated by God Himself. Now it was

1. The fierce fanaticism with which the Jews insisted upon the rite of circumcision is clearly brought out in the *Book of Jubilees*, XV, 25 ff. : " This law is for all generations forever, and there is no circumcision of the time, and no passing over one day out of the eight days ; for it is an eternal ordinance, ordained and written on the heavenly tables. And every one that is born, the flesh of whose foreskin is not circumcised on the eighth day, belongs not to the children of the covenant which the Lord made with Abraham, for he belongs to the children of destruction ; nor is there moreover any sign on him that he is the Lord's, but he is destined to be destroyed and slain from the earth ", etc. So too the *Talmud* recognizes no merit in the good deeds of heathen unless they are accompanied by a definite wish for admission to the privileges of Judaism. Even if a heathen were to keep the whole Law it would avail him nothing without circumcision (Debbarim Rabba I). If he prays to God, his prayer is not heard. If he commits sin and repents, that too does not help him (Pesikta, 156[a]). Even for his alms he gets no credit (Pesikta 12[b]). In the books in which God sets down the action of the heathen there is no desert (Shir Rabba 86[c]). Indeed so absolute is circumcision as a mark of God's favor, that if an Israelite has practised idolatry his circumcision must first be removed before he can go down to gehenna. Cf. LESETRE, art. *Circoncision*, VDB, vol. I, pp. 772-780.

the Law of Moses which clearly proposed these precepts, which the patriarchs had already anticipatorily observed, and the role of the Messias was to make this Law reign over both Jew and Gentile. Abraham, the Law, Christ, follow in harmonious succession, and it is absolutely necessary to observe the Law if one wishes to be accounted just before God. Was not therefore Saint Paul's teaching a denial of all inspiration ? Was not well-nigh every line of the five books of Moses against him ? Who was he that he should set himself against the great law-giver ? If he argued that the Law was abrogated, how could he prove it ? Did not Christ say that not a fraction of a letter of the Law should pass till all was fulfilled ? Yea, did not Christ become a servant of sin if by Him the Law as a norm of action was to be set aside (Gal. II, 17) ? And finally did not the Twelve observe the Law ? It is true that Christ by His Passion made justification by the Law easier and more accessible, but He did not thereby establish a new economy, and His death in no way diminished the eternal value of the Law. His sufferings, though of a much superior order, were analogous to the expiations of the just of the Old Testament, and were to be considered as a treasure acquired for the community to cover the transgressions of the Law and supplement the insufficiency of personal justice. Such we may surmise, by penetrating further the indirect statements of the Apostle in the Galatian Epistle, were the arguments used by the Judaizers to pervert the Gentile Christians of Galatia.

Some authors, however, as Aherne [1], Cornely [2], Toussaint [3], and Ramsay [4], maintain that the Judaizers did not impose

---

1. Art. *Galatians*, CE, vol. VI, p. 338 : " The Epistle was written to counteract the influence of a few Judaizers who had come amongst the Galatians and were endeavoring to persuade them that in order to be perfect Christians it was necessary to be circumcised and observe the Law of Moses... They said that what Saint Paul taught was good as far as it went, but that he had not taught the full perfection of Christianity ".

2. *Epistolae ad Corinthios altera et ad Galatas*, p. 364 : " Apostolicum decretum igitur nec impugnantes nec in dubium vocantes neophytis non circumcisis salutem non negabant, sed maiorem eos assecuturos esse perfectionem si circumcisioni sese subjicerent dictitantes ".

3. *Épître aux Galates*, p. 174 : " On ne prêche plus ici la nécessité absolue de la circoncision mais seulement les prérogatives qu'elle confère à ceux qui la reçoivent ".

4. *Historical Commentary on the Galatians*, p. 324 f. : " The Galatian Christians had been led astray by a theory of higher and lower steps in Christianity... They (the Judaizers) did not contend as many Jews previous

the Law as a necessary condition of salvation, but only as a " work of perfection ", or of " supererogation " for the " full perfection of Christianity " and for obtaining greater spiritual blessings and privileges. The argument generally adduced in support of this thesis is taken from Gal. III, 2, 3 : τοῦτο μόνον θέλω μαθεῖν ἀφ' ὑμῶν, ἐξ ἔργων νόμου τὸ πνεῦμα ἐλάβετε ἢ ἐξ ἀκοῆς πίστεως ; οὕτως ἀνόητοί ἐστε ; ἐναρξάμενοι πνεύματι νῦν σαρκὶ ἐπιτελεῖσθε. But their interpretation of this text, especially when viewed in the light of IV, 9-10 is not very convincing, having against it, besides, the context of the whole epistle. The primary idea in the Galatian Epistle is the inutility and powerlessness of the Law to obtain justification and salvation. The works of the Law, says Saint Paul, cannot communicate the Spirit (III, 2), cannot justify (II, 16), nor give life (III, 21). " If the inheritance be of the Law " it is no longer the fruit of the promise (III, 18). Those who seek their justification in the law are made void of Christ (V, 4), and " in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything nor uncircumcision, but faith that worketh by charity " (V, 6 ; VI, 15). It is only " by the hearing of faith " (III, 2) that the Galatians received the Spirit, it is by the faith of Jesus Christ that man is justified (II, 16), and becomes a son of Abraham, a partaker of the promises, and a heir of the kingdom (III, 9, 29 ; IV, 7 ; V, 5). The two economies are absolutely incompatible. In fact the error is so grave that Saint Paul twice pronounces anathema against his adversaries (I, 8, 9), and reminds them that his own gospel has been approved by the apostles, the " pillars " of the church of Jerusalem (II, 2). The situation is so serious that the Apostle fears lest perhaps he laboured in vain among the Galatians (IV, 11) who for a time " did run well " (V, 7) ; the adversaries would exclude them (IV, 17) but Saint Paul will again labor until Christ be formed in them (IV, 19). All these and similar passages clearly show that the question at issue is not that of higher perfection but of salvation and justification itself. Someone might object, it is true, that if

---

to the Council and decree had contented, that in order to become a Christian the pagan convert must accept the Mosaic Law... it had been decided that that contention was wrong and wicked... but the Decree readily lends itself to a quite plausible interpretation that the four conditions are a minimum, a mere concession to the weakness of those who were unfit to bear a ' great burden ' and that those who had strength to bear more should voluntarily go on to the perfect stage of bearing the whole burden ".

the Judaizers preached the absolute necessity of the Law for salvation, Saint Paul could have silenced them by recalling to them the decree of the Council of Jerusalem. But is not the aim of the historical part of the Epistle (I, II), precisely to oppose to the Judaizers the decision of the Apostles and elders at Jerusalem ? Of course, the Apostle does not reproduce it under its official form, which was a letter addressed to the brethren of Antioch, Syria, and Cilicia (Acts XV, 22, 29). And rather than reproduce it in his epistle, he contents himself by simply showing that the question had been determined and decided at Jerusalem for the whole world, and that his own gospel in particular was approved by the apostles [1].

We have seen above what were the arguments used by the Judaizers to pervert the Gentile Christians of Galatia. Saint Paul saw that it was time to speak out for the matter at issue was of vital importance. The very liberty which Christ had given, the very Redemption for which He died was at stake. Hence hot with anger he wrote the epistle to the Galatians in which he set forth his teaching in regard to the Law and its place in the economy of salvation. But writing in the heat of conflict against unscrupulous antagonists and against dangerous errors, the Apostle necessarily expressed himself with great force, conciseness, and brevity. For a comprehensive and thorough knowledge of Saint Paul's standpoint in regard to the Law, it will be necessary to supplement the Galatian Epistle with the more calm and deliberate developments of the Epistle to the Romans written some time after the former [2].

It seems, however, that in these two epistles the appreciation and evaluation of the Law are not only different but even contradictory. In the former Saint Paul is very outspoken and vehement in his opposition to the Law, while in the latter he seems to be moderate in his views and more sparing in his language and expressions. In Galatians the Apostle says that while under the Law men were in servitude under τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου, the weak and beggarly " elements, whereas in Romans

1. Cf. BENZ, *Die Ethik des Apostels Paulus*, BS, 1912, p. 52, WIESER, *Pauli Apostoli doctrina de justificatione*, pp. 23-41, TOBAC, *Le problème de la justification dans saint Paul*, pp. 20-28, LAGRANGE, *Épître aux Galates*, Introd. p. XXXVIII f.

2. The two epistles have not however the same theme. The central idea of the Epistle to the Romans is the justification and sanctification of the

he says that the Law was ἅγιος and πνευματικός (Gal. IV, 3, 9 ; Rom. VII, 10, 14). To understand these differences we must remember that Saint Paul is not a dogmatiser, who draws his views and theories with an absolute and logical sequence from an abstract system, but a preacher of the Gospel, directing his instructions according to the different needs of his spiritual children. His first and foremost aim is to win his listener and reader, and in this endeavour he became a servant to all (I Cor. IX, 19). He must approach different opponents in different ways, and where the danger is great, as in the case of the imminent defection of the Galatians from Christianity, he will naturally express himself with more severity (Gal. V, 12). For it must be remembered that the opponents who urged the necessity of circumcision advocated it as an essential condition of salvation. It was not against circumcision as such (cf. Acts XVI, 3 ; Rom. II, 25 ; Gal. VI, 15) that Paul waged his polemic but against it when put forth as a rival or co-ordinate condition of salvation with faith in Christ. There cannot be two ways of salvation : if faith in Christ is the true way, then circumcision and works of the Law are excluded. Among the Romans, on the contrary, these extreme Judaizing tendencies did not exist. They were indeed liable to misapprehend the relation of the Law to the Gospel ; and in his epistle to them the Apostle entered at length into the discussion of the subject but rather for the purpose of edification and instruction than for the refutation of zealous and dangerous fanatics. Hence while he in no way denies the disastrous consequences and evil effects which the Law called forth, he energetically defends its divine and inviolable character. To speak to the Galatians of the Law as ἅγιος and πνευματικός would have under the circumstances only increased difficulties and misunderstandings ; nevertheless, even in Galatians when the Apostle has occasion to refer to the ethical side of the Law his manner of expressing himself is not a whit less reverential than in Romans (Gal. V, 14). But in both cases, in his claim of the abrogation of the Law he always remained true to him-

Christian. The question of the Law and of the Jews is secondary, destined principally to set the primary theme in its full light. The contrary is true of the Epistle to the Galatians. The theme which eliminates the Law and the pretentions of the Jews holds first place, while what concerns Christian life and justification by faith serves only to prove the principal thesis. Cf. LAGRANGE, *Épître aux Galates*, Intr. p. LXIII ff., PRAT, o. c., vol. I⁹, p. 192-193.

self, and his doctrine in this regard underwent no development or change. The truth of the above statements will become more evident when we come to consider in detail the Apostle's teaching concerning the Law ; but before doing so we must first determine the precise usage in the Pauline Epistles of the term, νόμος.

II. THE PAULINE USAGE OF THE TERM, Νόμος.

The question of the Mosaic Law occupies a very prominent place in Saint Paul's teaching. In the four great epistles the word νόμος is to be found more than hundred and ten times, appearing thirty times in the short epistle to the Galatians and more than seventy times in the epistle to the Romans. What exactly then does Saint Paul mean by the term, νόμος [1] ? The Apostle sometimes has the word with, sometimes without the article. Hence the question arises, is the meaning the same in the two cases ? The problem cannot be solved and answered on any a priori grounds, but the word in each case must be studied in its context. The distinction between the two forms did not escape the scholarship of Origen who already thus commented on Rom. III, 21 : *Moris est apud Graecos nominibus ἄρθα praeponi quae apud nos possunt articuli nominari. Si quando igitur Mosis legem nominat, solitum nomini praemittit articulum ; si quando vero naturalem vult intelligi, sine articulo nominat legem* (ed. Lom. VI, 201).

---

1. In the Old Testament the Law, i. e. the legislation formulated in the Pentateuch and having Moses for its author and promulgator is at times called the תּוֹרָה *par excellence* (Dt I, 5, IV, 8 ; Jos. I, 7 ; 4 Kgs XXVII, 13). Sometimes it is also called the Law of God (II Par. XVII, 9 ; I Esdras VII, 10 ; II Esdras VIII, 18), or the Law of Moses (3 Kgs II, 3 ; 4 Kgs XIV, 6).

The Hebrew word for " Law " is תּוֹרָה from הוֹרָה (Hiphil of יָרָה), meaning to " point out " (Gen. XLVI, 28) or " to direct " (Jdgs XIII, 8), and hence properly denotes a direction given in Jehovah's name on points of moral religious or ceremonial duty. As synonyms of תּוֹרָה we find used in the Old Testament a) מִשְׁפָּט b) חֹק or חֻקָּה, c) מִצְוָה, d) עֵדוּת, and e) פִּקּוּדִים ; תּוֹרָה ordinarily comprises the ensemble of laws (Exod. XIII, 9 ; XIV, 4, 28), though sometimes it refers to particular laws (Lev. VI, 9 ; XI, 46 ; Num. V, 29 , VI, 13). Cf. BURTON, o. c., p. 445. CREMER, *Wörterbuch der neutestamentlichen Gräcität*[9], pp. 711-722.

The Mosaic Law does not present itself in the Pentateuch under the form of a code arranged in logical order. The different articles are occasionally attached to historical facts, or follow one another without any apparent

When Saint Paul speaks of ὁ νόμος it may be said that the Mosaic Law is specifically designated thereby [1]. For there was nothing else in the world to describe by that name ; it denoted for the readers something with which they were familiar, " their own law " (cf. Rom. II, 14b, 17, 23b, 26 ; III, 19b ; IV, 15 ; VII, 7bc, 12, 14, 16 ; VIII, 3 ; X, 5 ; I Cor. XV, 56 ; Gal. III, 12, 17, 19, 24, etc.) Like ὁ νόμος so too νόμος refers to the Mosaic Law. Of this we have many unmistakable and clear examples in the second chapter of the epistle to the Romans and in the epistle to the Galatians. In the former after the Apostle had branded the insolent brow of paganism and proved the guilt of the Gentiles, he turns with consummate tact to the Jews. After a few general statements whereby the self-satisfied Jew has been insensibly entrapped, Saint Paul bursts out in questions of indignant eloquence and serious denunciations : " But if ", says the Apostle, " if thou vauntest the proud name of Jew and makest the Law the pillow of thy confidence (II, 17 : εἰ δὲ σὺ Ἰουδαῖος ἐπονομαζῃ καὶ ἐπαναπαύῃ νόμῳ), being instructed in the Law from infancy (II, 18 : κατηχούμενος ἐκ τοῦ νόμου), and possessing the very form and body of knowledge and truth in the Law (II, 20 : ἔχοντα τὴν μόρφωσιν τῆς γνώσεως καὶ τῆς ἀληθείας ἐν τῳ νόμῳ), thou, who boastest in the Law (II, 23 : ὃς ἐν νόμῳ καυχᾶσαι), does thou not by violating the Law dishonor God " (II, 23 : διὰ τῆς παραβάσεως τοῦ νομοῦ τὸν θεὸν ἀτιμάζεις) ? Here ὁ νόμος and νόμος are used indiscriminately while the context unmistakably points to the Law of Moses. A similar striking instance is to be found in Gal. III,

---

connection. One may for the sake of convenience group them under four principal titles : a) the *moral laws*, comprising the fundamental law, the Decalogue, positive laws concerning justice, benevolence, restitution, etc., prohibitive laws concerning idolatry, superstition, etc. ; b) *ceremonial laws*, concerning persons, places of worship, sacred seasons, rites, etc. ; c) *civil laws*, concerning institutions of government, social institutions, symbolical prescriptions, etc. ; d) *penal laws*, relating to the penalty of death, the mode of execution, and other pains.

1. There are a few cases however where ὁ νόμος, even if used without any qualification, has a different meaning. Thus in Rom. VII, 1 : Ἢ ἀγνοεῖτε ἀδελφοί, γινώσκουσιν γὰρ νόμον λαλῶ, ὅτι ὁ νόμος κυριεύει τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐφ' ὅσον χρόνον ζῇ, the reference of ὁ νόμος is not the Mosaic Law but a law as understood by all peoples of the civilized world who practise marriage. So too in Rom. VII, 21 : εὑρίσκω ἄρα τὸν νόμον τῷ θέλοντι ἐμοὶ ποιεῖν τὸ καλόν, ὅτι ἐμοὶ τὸ κακὸν παράκειται, to make τὸν νόμον designate the Mosaic Law would be either to read into the passage more than the context will allow, or to give the sentence a construction which would be linguistically intolerable.

23, 24, where Saint Paul says that before the faith came we were under watch and ward of the Law (πρό τοῦ δὲ ἐλθεῖν τὴν πίστιν ὑπὸ νόμον ἐφρουρούμεθα), so that the Law became our tutor until Christ (ὥστε ὁ νόμος παιδαγωγὸς ἡμῶν γέγονεν εἰς Χριστόν) (cf. also : Rom. III, 20b, 31 ; IV, 13-15 ; V, 13, 20 ; X, 4 ; I Cor. IX, 20 ; Gal. II, 19 ; III, 11 ; VI, 13).

A few observations might here be made to explain this indiscriminate usage of ὁ νόμος and νόμος to designate the Mosaic Law. In the first place it is to be noted that νόμος in the genitive case never has the article if the substantive which governs it is without the article. Striking examples of this usage are found in Rom. X, 4 : τέλος γὰρ νόμου Χριστός, and in XIII, 10 : πλήρωμα οὖν νόμου ἡ ἀγάπη [1]. On the other hand, νόμος, with one exception (Rom. II, 3 οἱ ἀκροαταὶ νόμου ; οἱ ποιηταὶ νόμου) has the article if the substantive has it [2]. The article is, however, often omitted if νόμος is governed by a preposition, either because a better rhythm is thereby procured, or because the Apostle considered νόμος as a quasi-technical term [3].

Again, we have instances of the usage of the term νόμος which are not so much exceptions to the general use as variations in the formal conception. Thus in Gal. IV, 21 (τ�ὸν νόμον οὐκ ἀκούετε) and in I Cor. XIV, 34 (καθὼς καὶ ὁ νόμος λέγει) the term denotes the law considered as a book, the Thorah. In Rom. III, 19 (οἴδαμεν δὲ ὅτι ὅσα ὁ νόμος λέγει τοῖς ἐν τῷ νομῳ λαλεῖ) and I Cor. XIV, 21 (ἐν τῷ νόμῳ γέγραπται) ὁ νόμος appears as a name for the Old Testament as a whole ; this use of the term by synedoche probably has its ground in the popular

1. Rom. II, 25 : ἐὰν δὲ παραβάτης νόμου ἦς.
   II, 27 : διὰ γράμματος καὶ περιτομῆς παραβάτην νόμου.
   Gal. II, 16 : ἐξ ἔργων νόμου (cf. III, 2, 5, 10).
2. Rom. II, 15 : τὸ ἔργον τοῦ νόμου.
   II, 23 : διὰ τῆς παραβάσεως τοῦ νόμου.
   II, 26 : τὰ δικαιώματα τοῦ νόμου.
   VIII, 3 : τὸ γὰρ ἀδύνατον τοῦ νόμου.
   Gal. III, 10 : ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τοῦ νόμου.
   III, 13 : ἐκ τῆς κατάρας τοῦ νόμου.
3. Rom. II, 12 : ὅσοι ἐν νόμῳ ἥμαρτον.
   II, 12 : διὰ νόμου κριθήσονται.
   III, 21 : χωρὶς νόμου δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ.
   V, 13 : ἄχρι γὰρ νόμου.
   VI, 15 : οὐκ ἐσμέν ὑπὸ νόμον.
   IX, 13 : δικαιοσὐνης εἰς νόμον οὐκ ἔφθασεν. (cf. also Gal. III 18 ; Phil. III, 5).

Jewish view of the Law as a pre-eminent revelation of the divine will ; the paramount authority which the Pharisees assigned to the Law would easily explain this form of expression, especially since the legal spirit in religion which was so characteristic of this sect would naturally invest the whole Old Testament with kindred associations. Again, on two occasions (Rom. VII, 22 ; VIII, 7) the Law is called ὁ νόμος τοῦ θεοῦ, and in Rom. III, 21 is mentioned under the same title with the prophets [1]. In Gal. VI, 2, where the Apostle exhorts his readers to bear one another's burden and so to fulfill τὸν νόμον τοῦ Χριστοῦ, his meaning is evidently that the principle which Christ commanded and illustrated in His life requires the disciples to share the cares and troubles of others.

Furthermore, Saint Paul designates by νόμος the whole Mosaic code. The division of the law into moral and ceremonial portions is not made in the Apostle's writings but is a modern classification. He who insists upon continuing under the Law rather than under the gracious system of the Gospel (Rom. VI, 14) thereby binds himself to observe the Law in its entirety (cf. Gal. III, 10). The Law as a whole was done away with in Christianity. Its provisional and imperfect elements, whether ethical, ritual, or social, fell into abeyance when the progressive course of divine revelation had culminated in Christ. Saint Paul's conception of the Law as a unit did not preclude however his emphasizing, according to his purpose, certain elements or phases of the Law, as in Rom. II, 14, 26, where he supposes a doing of the Law by the heathen, or in Gal. V, 14, Rom. XIII, 9, 10, where he declares love to be the fulfilling of the Law ; in these cases he must have been thinking of the Law in its ethical requirements.

As to the origin of the Law, the Apostle energetically defends its divine and inviolable character (Rom. VII, 12, 14). In his argument to show that the law quickens the consciousness of sin, he is careful to guard against the view that this fact is due to any moral defect in the Law itself (Rom. VII, 7 ff.). In urging the contrast between the principles and effects

1. Cf. Mt. VII, 21 ; XI, 13 ; XXII, 40 ; Lk. XVI, 16 ; Acts VIII, 15, XXIV, 14, XXVIII, 23. The prophets are mentioned together with the Law because their ordinary ministry consisted in procuring obedience to the divine Mosaic Law ; cf. Ez. III. 17, 18 ; XX, 11, 12 ; XXII, 8 ; Jer. XVII, 20-27 ; Is. LVI, 2, 6, 7 ; Osee VI, 6 ; Amos V. 21-24 ; Mich. VI, 68 ; 4 Kings XVII, 13.

of the legal system and those of the gracious system of promise he maintains that there is no conflict between them (Gal. III, 21). The true relation of the Law to the Gospel is that of a subordinate position and preparatory office. The two come into collision only when this position of the Law is misunderstood, and the Law is required as a means of salvation which it never can be. The underlying principles of the Gospel, grace, faith, and promise (Gal. III, 6-9 ; Rom. IV, 13-17) antedate the Law and have been operative in salvation from the beginning. The Law is only a subsequent dispensation (Gal. III, 17).

We have seen then that the term, νόμος, denotes the Mosaic Law, even in those cases where the formal conception somewhat varies. We have also noted that νόμος denotes the Law *en bloc* and that the Apostle considered it to be of divine origin But we must call attention to a furthur usage of νόμος (without the article). While by ὁ νόμος Saint Paul denotes specifically the Mosaic Law, when he speaks of νόμος he still refers to that law, but contemplates it more generically ; the absence of the article calls attention to it, not as proceeding from Moses, nor as the historical institution with which the Jews were familiar, but simply and generally in its quality as law, *non quia Moysis, sed quia lex.* Saint Paul regarded the pre-Messianic period as essentially a period of law both for Jew and Gentile. Hence when he wishes to bring this out he uses νόμος without the article even when he is referring to the Jews, because his main point is that they were under a legal system, — who gave it and what name it bore was a secondary consideration. The Law of the Jews was only a typical example of a state of things that was universal. Rom. V, 20 is usually regarded as a decisive case against this theory. But it is much more relevant to the Apostle's argument if we render " Law came in " (νόμος δὲ παρεισῆλθεν) instead of " the Law ". Saint Paul is writing of the great spiritual forces which have dominated the history of humanity, namely, Sin, Law, Grace, and it is in their character as such and not in their historical definiteness that he is concerned with them. It was because he could conceive of the Law of Moses not merely as Mosaic but also as simply legal that he could find an analogue to it among the Gentiles (Rom. II, 14). They too have an idea of a task to be done, and their natural legality disposes them to aim at achieving justice, and on this ground claim the approba-

tion of God. This is what Saint Paul means by attaining justice ἐξ ἔργων νόμου ; the Law of Moses is included, not as Mosaic but as legal [1].

At times Saint Paul uses νόμος in a metaphorical sense. Thus in Rom. III, 27 he says : Ποῦ οὖν ἡ καύχησις ; ἐξεκλείσθη διὰ ποίου νόμου ; τῶν ἔργων ; οὐχί, ἀλλὰ διὰ νόμου πίστεως. The Apostle says that the Jew can glory neither in his past where sin abounded nor in justification which is due to the Blood of Christ. His spiritual pride has been definitely excluded. The Jew gloried in the Law, and it is precisely a " law " which deprived him of all motives for boasting. What is this " law ", asks Saint Paul, employing the word " law ", because this term was a typical expression to the ancient mind of a system, of a constituted order of things. It is not the νόμος ἔργων for this cannot exclude pride since the Jew considered it as a special gift from God, and boasted of the works performed in obedience to it. But it is a " law ", a system, the essence of which is faith.

Besides this metaphorical application, Saint Paul uses νόμος in many other different senses [2]. By analogy he calls " law " the natural moral conscience of the Gentiles which enables them to accomplish the essential precepts of the Law. To the Jews who in their great zeal boasted of their Law, and pretended that they were superior to the Gentiles both spiritually and morally, Saint Paul points out that the latter also

---

1. Cf. WILLIAMS, *The Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Galatians*, p. 151 ff., PARRY, *The Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Romans*, p. 213 ; LIGHTFOOT, o. c. p. 117, 167 f., 210, 222, GREEN, *Handbook to the Grammar of the New Testament*, p. 200.

2. According to LAGRANGE, *Épître aux Romains*, pp. 164-175, the term νόμος in Rom. VII, 7-12, is to be distinguished from ἐντολή ; the former refers to all positive divine law, the latter specifically to the precept given to Adam in Paradise. But this explanation can with difficulty be harmonized with the context and especially with the meaning which ἡ ἁμαρτία receives in the Pauline Epistles. Ἡ ἁμαρτία, as we have seen above, refers to the Sin introduced into humanity by Adam's transgression ; hence it did not exist before Adam's fall, nor could it therefore have taken advantage of the precept to seduce him. And if ἡ ἁμαρτία is not Satan, what then is it ? Nor is this interpretation necessary to distinguish νόμος from ἐντολή. The latter as is evident from the use of the word in other passages (Rom. XIII, 9 ; cf. also I Cor. VII, 19 ; Eph. II, 15 ; VI, 2) refers to the last precept of the decalogue. Saint Paul quotes only the first two words of it because his first and foremost aim was to show that it was by the prohibition of the Law that he came to know the malice of inordinate and illicit desires.

have τὸ ἔργον τοῦ νόμου γραπτὸν ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν, an analogue of the Old Testament Law. Perhaps we have here also an allusion to the Noachic precepts which according to the Jewish opinion of the time were given by God to the pagans and whose contents were essentially the same as that of the Decalogue. Again, viewing the Law in its formal aspect as a normative and obligatory power rather than in the material ensemble of its prescriptions, Saint Paul speaks of a νόμος Χριστοῦ (Gal. VI, 2 ; I Cor. IX, 21), wishing thereby to show that the Christian possesses in Christ and His Spirit (Rom. VIII, 2) that power of obligation to which the Jew is subjected by the Mosaic Law. In Rom. c. VII we find similar derived applications of the Mosaic Law. Thus in VII, 23 Saint Paul says that he discovers an ἕτερον νόμον ἐν τοῖς μέλεσιν μου [1], i. e., he finds two imperatives (νόμοι) within man, that of conscience, and that proceeding from the action of sin upon the body. The " law of members " is said to be opposed to τῷ νόμῳ τοῦ νοός μου, the law of conscience, the faculty which decides between right and wrong. And finally in the same verse he distinguishes a third law, namely, the νόμος τῆς ἁμαρτίας, the power and dominion of Sin over fallen humanity [2].

We may here briefly summarize the conclusions of this part of our study. We have seen that in Pauline usage ὁ νόμος denotes specifically the Mosaic Law, while νόμος denotes that same Law but frequently in a general sense. We have also seen that νόμος denotes the Mosaic Law as a whole, and that the Apostle considers it to be of divine origin. Finally we have noticed certain metaphorical and analogous uses of the term to designate a directive or impelling force, a system, etc. We come now to consider in detail the Pauline teaching concern-

1. In these passages νόμος is used in a way which to the modern mind suggests some approach to the sense it now bears in physical science. Thus Rom. VII, 23 : " But I see another law in my members, fighting against the law of my mind, and captivating me in the law of sin, that is in my members ", is interpreted as the sinful mode in which my members normally or habitually act. So too Rom. VII, 21 : " I find then a law, that when I have a will to do good, evil is present within me " is interpreted to mean : " I find therefore this constantly recurring experience, this ' law ', in the sense of modern science, that when I would do good, evil is present within me ". But this interpretation is too advanced, for the law of modern science belongs to an intellectual world which was not then in being. Cf. SANDAY AND HEADLAM, *Epistle to the Romans*[5], p. 182.

2. Cf. PRAT, o. c. vol. I[9], p. 269, LAGRANGE, *Épître aux Romains*, p. 179.

ing the purpose of the Law in the economy of salvation. The general thesis of the Apostle is that the Law was not a means of justification. This assertion, which appears so frequently in his epistles, Saint Paul proves in a twofold manner : historically, by showing that Abraham was not justified by works but gratuitously by faith and that his spiritual paternity was likewise independent of the Law ; psychologically, by showing that the Law increased the knowledge of sin and in consequence divine wrath.

III. THE LAW NOT A MEANS OF JUSTIFICATION. — HISTORICAL ARGUMENTS.

The Apostle lays down the principle that it is faith and not the observance of the Law which is the condition, the very root and foundation of justification : " For we account a man to be justified by faith, without the works of the law " (Rom. III, 28 ; III, 20, 21, 22). This doctrine of justification by faith without the works of the Law is summarily stated in Gal. II, 15-21 : " We by nature are Jews and not of the Gentiles sinners. But knowing that man is not justified by the works of the law but by the faith of Jesus Christ ; we also believe in Christ Jesus, that we may be justified by the faith of Christ, and not by the works of the law : because by the works of the law no flesh shall be justified. But if while we seek to be justified in Christ, we ourselves also are found sinners, is Christ then the minister of sin ? God forbid. For if I build up again the things which I have destroyed, I make myself a prevaricator. For I through the law am dead to the law, that I may live to God, with Christ I am nailed to the cross. And I live, now not I, but Christ liveth in me. And that I live now in the flesh, I live in the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and delivered himself for me. I cast not away the grace of God. For if justice be by the law, then Christ died in vain ".

The above passage we think contains the following motives in favor of the Gospel freedom as against a continued servitude and bondage to the Law : first, Peter and Paul though Jews have recognized that man is not justified by works and in consequence have renounced the Law and believed in Jesus

Christ ; to return again to the Mosaic Law would be a retrogression in the way of salvation. Second, according to the testimony of Scripture no man is justified by one's own efforts, much less therefore by the observance of the Law. Third, it was because of the superabundant graces of the Redemption that the Judeo-Christians believed themselves to be dispensed from the Law ; if this freedom constituted them sinners, their sin would be a reflection on Christ, the author of their faith. Fourth, by the Law the Jews are dead to the Law to live unto Christ ; to regard the Law as still capable of imposing its commands, would be to violate it. Finally, since the death of Christ has an infinite value, to establish another means of justification would be to deny the redeeming value of Christ's Cross.

But there yet remained for Saint Paul the crucial case of Abraham to be solved. The adversaries of the Apostle maintained that his Gospel was incomplete. Christianity they said, although it was a new alliance did not abrogate the old. On the contrary, Jesus Christ was a descendant of Abraham to whom were promised the blessings, and thus all revelation constitutes a continuous whole, one sole religion. To become a participant therefore in the Messianic blessings promised to Abraham and to his posterity one must belong to his seed. However, is it not precisely by circumcision, the sign of the covenant between God and Abraham, and by the observance of the Law by which God separated the chosen race from other peoples, that one is grafted on to the seed of Abraham ? Though faith is useful, the Law still remains a necessary condition of salvation. Hence if the Christian wishes to share in the Messianic blessings he must be circumcised and observe the Law. Saint Paul clearly saw that the case of Abraham was the centre and stronghold of the whole Jewish position. If therefore it could be shown that this case made for the Christian conclusion and not for the Jewish the latter would break down altogether.

Saint Paul therefore proceeds to show that his gospel of justification by faith is that which best interprets the Hebrew Scriptures, is true to their deepest spirit, and that the men who oppose him do not understand those sacred books but read them with a veil upon their face. It might here be noted that rarely has the Apostle written so masterfully, rarely has

the breadth and subtlety of his reasoning, his grasp of the spiritual forces underlying the facts of history, been so conspicuously manifest as in this magnificent reconstruction of the course of sacred history [1]. He condenses into a few pregnant sentences the *raison d'être* of Judaism, explaining the method of God's dealing with mankind from Abraham down to Christ, and fitting the legal system into its place with an unusual exactness and consistency. So completely free is Saint Paul from the modes of Jewish thought that the whole Mosaic economy becomes to his mind no more than a mere interlude, a passing stage in the progress of revelation.

A. *Abraham's Justification by Faith.*

It was in connection with his Galatian converts that Saint Paul was first led to mention Abraham's justification by faith. The Apostle had depicted the image of the crucified Redeemer before the eyes of the Galatians in glowing colors. He instructed them most diligently and accurately about the death of Christ, its merits and its causes. He explained to them how the death of Christ was a unique event and how it could not have been decreed by God unless it were for the human race a cause of salvation (II, 21). He applied to them the lesson which resulted from the incident at Antioch, and told them the very things which he said to Peter. Yet in spite of all this the Galatians sought to be justified by works of the Law and thereby underrated the death of Christ. Since the picture of the crucified Saviour exposed to their gaze was not sufficient to dissipate their error, a simple question on the part of Saint Paul would open their eyes. The Galatians themselves whose good faith the Apostle knew had the means of solving the question of works by a decisive argument [2].

Saint Paul therefore asks : how did the Galatians receive the Spirit, by faith or by the Law ? And whence come the continuous and prodigious manifestations of the Spirit ? And the Galatian converts could have only one answer : by faith,

1. Against S. Baring-Gould, *A Study of St. Paul*, p. 270 ff.

2. Cf. Lagrange, *Épître aux Galates*, pp. 62-67, Lemonnyer, *Épîtres de s. Paul*, Vol. I, p. 70 ff., Cornely, *Epistolae ad Corinthios altera et ad Galatas*, p. 466 ff.

for they had never observed the Law. They had received the Spirit, the interior principle of Christian life, and were conscious of His presence not only by external miraculous signs and extraordinary sensible prodigies, but also by the good desires which they had experienced and the lights which they had received. But the Galatian Christians had never observed the Law, and hence it was impossible that the observance of the Law had any influence on their justification either as cause, essential condition, or previous disposition. Hence not observing the Law of which they were ignorant but submitting to the faith preached to them, the Galatians were justified and received the Spirit (Gal. III, 1-5).

But Saint Paul in his great disappointment at the inconstancy of the Galatian converts, not being content to propose the question in one way, namely, whether they disposed themselves to receive the Spirit by faith or by the Law,again asks them how in turn God was moved, as it were, to grant them the Spirit. And again the Galatians could have only one answer: they received the Spirit by hearing of faith, *ex obsequio fidei* (Gal. III, 2, 6). To convince them the more thoroughly of their foolishness in seeking perfection in the Law, he bids them recall all the tribulations which they endured in the beginning of their conversion, the fruits of which they were now imperilling. He reminds them how senseless they are in laying aside the *summum bonum*, faith, and contrary to all postulates of right reason in seeking perfection by the flesh. In fact Saint Paul cannot but attribute this estrangement to a fascination. By maintaining the necessity of the Law in the face of Calvary they deny the price of the Divine Blood and the sufficiency of the Redemption. Yet he is sure that a look on Jesus Christ who died to procure that justice which the Law could not give will surely break the charm.

Faith then, not works of the Law, was the condition on which the Galatians received the Spirit of Christ. By this gate they entered the Church of God, and came into the possession of the spiritual blessings common to all Christian believers, and of those extraordinary gifts which marked the Apostolic times. But in this mode of salvation there was after all nothing new, for, as the Apostle says, justification by faith is more ancient than legalism ; in the hoary patriarchal days as now, in the time of promise as of fulfillment, faith is the root of

justification. Abraham's religion rested on this ground, " as it is written : Abraham believed God, and it was reputed to him unto justice " (Gal. III, 6). It was the faith of Abraham which was the principle of his acts and the basis of his obedience ; it was faith which made him leave his country to come to Canaan ; it was by faith that he responded to the promises, and it was because this faith remained intact that he consented to immolate Isaac. Christians therefore who expect their salvation from the promise of God, who make an act of faith in His word, have Abraham as a type who was recognized as just because of his faith [1].

The faith of Abraham furnished the Apostle with a telling example, Gen. XV, 6 supplied a decisive proof-text for his doctrine ; it was the *instantia probans* in his debate with the Judaizers. " Abraham's bosom ", that was the Israelite's heaven, and to be of " Abraham's seed ", that was the title in which was concentrated all the theocratic pride and national bigotry of the Jews. The Apostle held as strongly as any Judaizer that the promise belongs to the children of Abraham, but he maintained that a son of Abraham is not he who is of Jewish blood or he who is circumcised but he who is of faith ; for Abraham himself owed his justice and his blessings to faith : " Abraham believed God ". Hence also " they who are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham " (Gal. III, 7). And that the identity of Abraham's blessing with that enjoyed by Gentile Christians may not be left to rest on mere inference and analogy of principle the Apostle adds another quotation to clinch the argument : " The scripture foreseeing that God justifieth the Gentiles by faith told unto Abraham before : in thee all

1. The text of Genesis XV, 6 : וְהֶאֱמִן בַּיהוָה וַיַּחְשְׁבֶהָ לוֹ צְדָקָה as LIGHTFOOT, *Epistle to the Galatians*, p. 157 ff., remarks was a standing thesis for discussion in the Jewish schools. It is referred to in the First Book of Maccabees II, 52 : " Was not Abraham found faithful in temptation, and it was imputed unto him for righteousness ". (Cf. also Eccli. XLIV, 20 ; IV Esdras IX, 7 ; Book of Jubilees XVII, 15-18 ; Apoc. of Bar. LIV, 16, 21). It is repeatedly quoted by Philo who commented on it no less than ten times. The Talmudic treatise " Mechilta " expounds the verse at length : " Great is faith, whereby Israel believed in Him that spoke and the world was. For as a reward for Israel's having believed in the Lord, the Holy Spirit dwelt in them... In like manner thou findest that Abraham our father inherited this world and the world to come solely by the merit of faith, whereby he believed in the Lord ; for it is said " and he believed in the Lord, and he counted it to him for righteousness ".

In Gal. III, 6 Saint Paul quotes the text to show that the faith of Abraham

nations (not the natural seed or the circumcised alone) shall be blessed " (Gal. III, 8, 9). In the " Father of the faithful " and " Friend of God " the Gentile believers therefore were to see their exemplar and find the warrant for that sufficiency of faith of which the natural children of Abraham unjustly strove to rob them. Hence two paths now lie open before the Galatian converts, — the Pauline and the legal, the Abrahamic and the Mosaic method of salvation. The latter tries to make God believe in man, the former believes in God ; the latter sets itself against God with its works and demands justice as a debt, the former commits itself to God through belief in Him and receives justification as a gift. It is this gratuitous character which the Apostle finds and emphasizes in the justification of Abraham.

B. *Abraham's Justification a Gratuitous Gift.*

Saint Paul frequently affirms that faith is a gift of God, a gratuitous gift : " For by grace you are saved through faith, and that not of yourselves, for it is the gift of God (θεοῦ τὸ δῶρον) ; not of works that no man may glory " (Eph. II, 8, 9). External preaching without the internal grace of God is insufficient : " Neither he that planteth is anything, nor he that watereth, but God who giveth the increase " (I Cor. III, 7). In fact, man if left to his natural instincts alone, cannot perceive divine things : " The sensual man perceiveth not these things which are of the Spirit of God ; for it is foolishness to him, and he cannot understand " (I Cor. II, 14). Hence it is evident that man is absolutely incapable of eliciting an act of faith without the aid of God. Faith, therefore, in so far as it supposes not only the ontological priority of grace but also the divine call

---

was a type of that of the Galatian Christians. Cf. LAGRANGE, *Épître aux Galates*, p. 64, CORNELY, *Epistolae ad Corinthios altera et ad Galatas*, p. 477. In Rom. IV, 3 the Apostle quotes Gen. XV, 6 to prove that Abraham was justified not by works but by faith, and that consequently his justification was gratuitous. In Gen. XV, 6 itself there is question of an increase of justice, but Saint Paul uses it as an " argumentum a minore ad maius ", i. e. if Abraham could not merit an increase of justice by works much less could he obtain first justice by works. As CORNELY, *Epistola ad Romanos*, p. 214, remarks : " uti ex fide qua Deo ipsum vocanti et ex patria exire jubenti sese subdidit, prima justitia erat, quæ nondum justificato collata est, ut justus fieret, ita ex fide etiam erat justitiæ augmentum, quod postea novis revelationibus credenti et ex fide formata operanti collatum est, ut justior fieret ". Cf. also LAGRANGE, *Épître aux Romains*, p. 84 ff., LEMONNYER, o. c., p. 271 ff.

made at a propitious moment is essentially a gift of God. From this conclusion Saint Paul draws two principles : since faith is a divine gift, the superstructure of which faith is the foundation, namely justification, is essentially gratuitous, and, secondly, since man cannot merit justification, he has no right to glory before God unless it be because of His blessings (Eph. II, 8, 9 ; Rom. IV, 2 ; III, 20, 24, 28 ; XI, 6).

But the Apostle, as preoccupied as he is to maintain the originality of the Christian religion, never detaches it from the, as it were, ancient designs of God. He is always careful to maintain the prerogatives of the Scriptures (Rom. III, 2), and in revealing the new justice he says that it was attested by the Law and by the Prophets (Rom. III, 21). In fact, his genius and the lights which he had received from God appear at their best in the harmony which the Apostle establishes between the Ancient and the New Alliance. If he could therefore point to Abraham as to the living realization of his doctrine he would give to his Gospel a basis of incomparable weight and value in the eyes of the Jews. The latter, as we know, considered Abraham as the first of the seven righteous men who brought back the Shekinah from the seventh heaven; they regarded him as the only righteous man of his generation, who merited to be the ancestor of the holy chosen race because of his consummate justice which he began at the age of three and perfected later by circumcision and the anticipatory and perfect fulfilment of the precepts of the Law.

Arguing therefore in Rom. IV, 1-3 with an imaginary Jewish opponent, he says to him : you will admit that Abraham, the carnal ancestor of our nation, received justification, but the question is how was he justified ? If he had earned justification by good deeds, he indeed had something to boast of (III, 27), he could say that he owed it to his personal merits. But what do the Scriptures say : " Abraham believed God and it was reputed to him unto justice " (IV, 3 ; Gen. XV, 6). The Apostle therefore finds that faith in the promises produced the same effect as faith in the Gospel. Saint Paul does not say that faith was justice or the equivalent of justice, nor does he treat directly of the manner in which Abraham received justice or of the change which was then produced in his soul. The essential point is that Abraham was reckoned as just by Scripture

not because of his works but because of his faith [1]. And since he was justified by faith his justification was gratuitous ; consequently, although he might have glory before the Pharisees and the Jewish nation who honored his memory and good deeds, Abraham has nothing to boast of before God (IV, 2, 4). He therefore who in the eyes of the Jews was the model of righteousness obtained justification in an entirely different manner than the Pharisees, who regarded justice as placed within the sphere of their natural activity and boasted of obtaining it by right *ex opere operato*, by their material observances of the Law (IV, 4).

Saint Paul foresees however that certain further subtle distinctions and objections might be made by his adversaries. Thus they might say that Abraham was circumcised and that there consequently was a causal relation between this sacred rite and Abraham's justification. The Apostle will therefore show that there was no foundation for this claim of his opponents. Abraham, he says, to quote again the text of Genesis, was justified when his faith was reputed to justice (Rom. IV, 9). Now a *rapprochement* and comparison of the data of Genesis clearly show that Abraham was justified before his circumcision. For in Genesis c. 15 we read that Abraham believed and that it was reputed to him unto justice, while it is only in c. 18 that we find related the divine precept of circumcision. But what then was the purpose of circumcision ? Saint Paul in answer says that the sign of the covenant was to be an attestation of the justice through faith which Abraham already had before he was circumcised [2]. The circumcision came in only after the declaration made to Abraham to ratify a verdict already given and, like a seal affixed to a document,

---

1. CORNELY, *Epistola ad Romanos*, p. 214, says : " Paulum non de solo fidei actu qui Gen. XV, 5, 6, commemoratur, sed de tota fide, qua inde a prima sua vocatione (Gen. XII, 1) patriarcha semper intellectum voluntatemque auctoritati Dei revelantis, promittentis, præcipientis subjiciebat, cogitasse censemus, ut eam initium et fundamentum et radicem totius justitiæ Abrahæ fuisse insinuaret ". (Compare Rom. IV, 17 and Gen. XVII,4 ; Rom. IV, 19-21 and Gen. XV, 15 ; Gal. III, 6-8 and Gen. XII, 1, 3). So too according to LAGRANGE, art. *La justification d'après saint Paul*, RB, 1914, pp. 494-503, Saint Paul in Rom. IV, 3 insists primarily not on the first justification of Abraham, but on the fact that Abraham's justification was gratuitous, that he was reckoned as just by God not because of his works but because of his faith.

2. TOUSSAINT, *Épître aux Romains* p. 146 well remarks : " La circoncision, d'après la Genèse elle-même (XVII, 11) étant donné comme signe de l'alliance

to authenticate in a material and sensible way a state of things already existing (Rom. IV, 11). The reason for this was that Abraham might be the spiritual father alike of two divergent classes : at once of believing Gentiles who though uncircumcised have a faith like his so that justice might also be reckoned unto them, and at the same time of believing Jews who do not depend on their circumcision only but whose " files march duly " in the steps of Abraham's faith which was his before the circumcision (Rom. IV, 11, 12).

However, the Judaizers might be disposed to grant all this. They might allow that God covenanted with Abraham on terms of faith, and that believing Gentiles are entitled to his blessing. Nevertheless, they might still urge and ask : did not God make a second covenant with Moses, promising further blessings upon terms of the Law ? Does not one covenant remain as valid as the other ? Must not the Gentiles pass from the school of Abraham on to the school of Moses ? Is not faith merely the first step in the new life, and the discipline of the Law its necessary completion ?

C. *Abraham's Spiritual Paternity Independent of the Law.*

The Apostle accordingly had this further prejudice of the Jews to meet. This promise of the inheritance made to Abraham and his posterity, and interpreted at first as referring to the possession of Canaan and later to a domination over the whole universe, had excited Pharisaic pride to its highest degree. The fulfilment of this promise, it was maintained, was conditioned by a faithful observance of the Law [1].

---

entre Jahvé et son peuple, il fallait, avant de la porter dans sa chair, qu'Abraham fût sanctifié. Dieu ne pouvait faire alliance avec un pécheur et un ennemi ".

1. The idea of promise is one of the great elements of Scripture teaching. The idea of the promise runs through its various books, binds them into an organic whole, and unites into a vital union the Old Testament and the New. In regard to the general subject of prophecy it stands related as the heart to the whole body ; it is its very core, and constitutes its life-principle. In its technical sense promise denotes all the gracious perspectives of future blessings for Abraham and his posterity. In a large sense it embraces all the Messianic blessings up to their complete realisation in heaven. More particularly it included the possession of a stable dwelling (Gen. XII, 7 ; XIII, 15 ; XV, 18 ; XXVI, 4), a numerous posterity (Gen. XII, 12 ; XIII, 16 ; XV, 5 ; XXII, 17),

In combating this pretension of the Jews Saint Paul says that the promises of the Messianic Kingdom did not come through the observance of the Law but that they belong to a different economy of salvation, — to justification by faith (Rom. IV, 13 ; Gal. III, 7). For if this world-wide inheritance really depended on any legal system, if it were limited to those who were under such a system, no place would be left for faith to which Scripture attaches such efficacy, and the promises could thus never be realized ; faith would become an empty name, and the promises a dead letter. While faith and the promises had in view man's final beatitude, the Law of Moses tended to produce the opposite effect, to bring down punishment : " For the law worketh wrath " (Rom. IV, 15), and " as many as are of the works of the law are under a curse " (Gal. III, 10). Law and promise therefore are mutually exclusive, the one brings death and the other life. Hence it is that the Divine Plan was made to turn, not on Law and obedience to Law, but on faith. So that the heavenly inheritance depending as it did not on Law but on the broad conditions of faith and grace, was insured to the entire posterity of Abraham, not only for those who came under the Mosaic Law, but for all who could lay claim to a faith like his (Rom. IV, 16 ; Gal. III, 7, 8, 9, 14).

---

and, especially blessings which should extend to all the nations of the earth (Gen. XII, 13 ; XVIII, 18 ; XXII, 18 ; XXVI, 4).

Saint Paul, whether he speaks of *a* promise (Rom. IV, 13-20 ; IX, 8-9 ; Gal. III, 17-19 ; IV, 23-28) or of many promises (Rom. IX, 4 ; XV, 8 ; II Cor. I, 20 ; Gal. III, 16-21), certainly considers them as having their fulfilment in Christ (II Cor. I, 20). In fact in the Pauline theology Christ and Promise are practically synonymous terms. More particularly the Apostle says that the Christians are sealed with the Holy Spirit of the promise (Eph. I, 13), and receive the promise of the Spirit through faith (Gal. III, 14). The gift of the Spirit had something of promise in it, for it is the earnest of a heavenly inheritance with the saints in the light (Eph. I, 14 ; Col. I, 12); as the Spirit of sonship it is the assurance that we are joint heirs with Christ, and shall be conformed to the image of God's glorified Son (Rom. VIII, 15-17). The promise in so far as it is based on the free choice of God is elective (Rom. IX, 8), in so far as it is based on faith, is universal (Gal. III, 8) and in so far as it depends on union with Christ is collective (Gal. III, 16). In Hebrews under the influence of OT ideas, the original ideas of a country of our own, a land in which we shall not be strangers and pilgrims as on earth, a city with foundations, a rest like the Sabbath rest of God, an eternal inheritance into which we may enter after we have traversed the wilderness, reappear (Heb. XI, 9-16 ; IV, 1 ; IX, 15). Cf. DRISCOLL, art. *Promise*, CE, vol. XII, pp. 453-454, SANDAY AND HEADLAM, o. c., p. 111.

The Apostle in urging home his argument insists especially on the fixedness of the Abrahamic covenant [1]. Lifting himself above the Galatian quarrel and from the height of his argument addressing himself to the common intelligence of mankind, Saint Paul says : " Brethren, I speak after the manner of man ; a man's testament, if it be confirmed, no man despiseth, nor addeth to it " (Gal. III, 15). When a man has made a testament and it has been ratified, it stands complete and unchangeable, and no one has afterwards any power to set it aside or to attach to it a new codicil modifying its previous terms. Such a testament God gave to Abraham and his seed. It was confirmed by the final attestation made to the patriarch after the supreme trial of his faith in the sacrifice of Isaac (Gen. XXII, 16-18). The Law then has no power to cancel or restrict the promise which was older by almost four centuries and a half (Gal. III, 17). The later must be adjusted to the earlier dispensation, the Law interpreted by the promise. God did not make two testaments, the one solemnly committed to the faith and hope of mankind only to be retracted by something posterior. God did not thus stultify Himself. Hence we must not apply the Mosaic enactments addressed to a single people in such a way as to neutralise the original provisions made for the race at large ; our reverence for public compacts and established rights forbid such a procedure. Law therefore is not to be put on a level with the promise, for to read the Law as a continuation of the older instrument is virtually to efface the latter : " For if the inheritance be of the law, it is no more of promise " (Gal. III, 18)[2].

1. In Gal. III, 15 ff. the permanence of the promise is also emphasized by the tense of the verb relating to it ; the Greek perfect denotes facts of abiding significance, actions which carry with them finality. The verbs relating to Mosaism in this context are past in tense, describing what is now matter of history, a course of events that has come and gone (except v. 17 (γεγονώς) because it is a fact of abiding significance that the Law was so much later than the promise, and v. 24, because the work of the law as a tutor is an enduring benefit).

2. In spite of the Apostle's attitude towards the Law, it is to be noted how far his heart was on the side of those against whom he argues. Thus after having shown in Rom. c. 10 that the Jews by persistent disobedience have forfeited all title to be counted God's people and the heirs of His promise, he nevertheless tells us XI, 29 that " the gifts and the calling of God are without repentance ". After all there is no denying for the Apostle that Israel is God's people ; God has given them the promise and he cannot deny Himself.

The fact that the promise looked to Christ, lent additional force to the Apostle's assertion of its indelibility. The covenant did not lie between God and Abraham alone, but it embraced Abraham's descendants in their unity culminating in Christ. "To Abraham were the promises made and to his seed", — these words spanned the period of two thousand years and overarched the Mosaic dispensation; so that the covenant vouchsafed to Abraham even at that distance of time placed him in close relationship with mankind. Hence God's covenant with Abraham stands both first and last, and the Mosaic economy holds only a secondary and subsidiary place.

D. *Abraham's Promise Superior to the Mosaic Law.*

The Law of Moses revealed God's will in a veiled and accommodated fashion while the promise was its direct expression. This is evident from Gal. III, 19 where it is said that the Law was " ordained by angels in the hand of a mediator " [1]. These circumstances the orthodox Jew supposed enhanced the glory, splendour, and authority of the Law. The pomp and formality under which Mosaism was ushered in, the presence of the angelic host to whose agency the manifestations attending the Law-giving were referred, impressed the popular mind with the sacredness of the Sinaitic legislation. But the simplicity and informality of God's communion with Abraham, and again of Christ's appearance in the world and His intercourse with men, afford on the other hand a striking contrast to all this. In fact, a revelation administered through angels and a mediator speaks of a God distant and obscured, of a people unfit for access to His presence. This same thought is again expressed by the figure of " the veil on Moses' face " which Saint Paul employs in II Cor. III, 13-18 : in the external glory of the Sinaitic law-giving as in the illuminated face of the law-giver

In spite of all their unbelief " they are most dear for the sake of the fathers " (Rom. XI, 28). God will remember His oath to Abraham and so all Israel shall be saved. To the last the Jews were the first fruits while the Gentiles were only " comparticipes " (συνμέτοχα) of the promise (Eph. III, 6).

1. Saint Paul does not teach in Gal. III, 19 that the angels themselves enacted the Law, for like the Old Testament (Exod. XXXI, 18 ; XXXII, 16 ; Dt IX, 10) the Apostle clearly considers God as the author of the Law (Rom. III, 2 ; VII, 22, 25). The Angels therefore served only as ministers and intermediaries (Acts VII, 53, VII, 38 ; Heb. II, 2). In Acts VII, 53 Stephen recalls the ministry of angels in order that from the exalted dignity of the Law he

there was a fading brightness, a visible lustre concealing its imperfect and transitory character. Hence the form of the Mosaic revelation tended in reality not to exalt the Law but to exhibit its difference from the promise and the distance at which it placed men from God.

The Law employed a mediator while the promise did not (Gal. III, 19). Now the same antithesis between Law and promise found in Gal. III, 19 and III, 21 runs also through the intervening verse. The two clauses of v. 20 belong to the Law and promise respectively : " Now a mediator is not of one " (ὁ δὲ μεσίτης ἑνὸς οὐκ ἔστιν), — this is an axiom which holds good of the Law ; " but God is one " (ὁ δὲ θεὸς εἷς ἐστιν), — this truth, the first article of Israel's creed, applied to the promise. Let us now study more in detail the contents and meaning of this verse.

Authors are generally agreed that in this verse there is question of explaining the role of the μεσίτης of the Law after the function of a μεσίτης in general. Now the very idea of mediation supposes at least two persons, or two collectivities, or a person and a collectivity, between whom the mediation is carried on and between whom the mediator (μέσος) acts. The notion of μεσίτης merely demands that nothing be pre-arranged or regulated in advance, but that there be room for a *rapprochement* between two parties. And this was exactly what happened in the giving of the Law on Mount Sinai. The Law was of the nature of a contract between two parties, God on the one hand, and the Jewish people on the other. Placing the Law in the hand of a mediator (Exod. XXXI, 15), God indeed obliged Himself to grant the blessings, but He made these dependent on the observance of the Law : " He that doth these things shall live in them ". And the people, on the other hand, who constituted Moses as their mediator (Dt. V, 5), bound themselves to observe the Law in order to become

---

mights how of how great a crime the transgressors of the Law were guilty. In Heb. II, 2 Saint Paul concludes to the inferiority of the word uttered by the angels as compared with the immediate manner of speaking of the Son of God. So too in Gal. III, 19 the interposition of created beings is contrasted with the direct agency of God. There was a double interposition, a twofold mediation between the giver and the recipient. There were the angels who administered the Law as God's instruments ; there was Moses (ἐν χειρὶ μεσίτου, cf. Exod. XX, 19 ; XXXI, 15 ; Dt V, 12, 5 ; IX, 9) who delivered it to man . Cf. THACKERAY, o. c., p. 72 ff.

participants of the blessings (Dt. v, 24). The contract was valid therefore as long as both parties fulfilled the terms of the contract.

This view that the μεσίτης refers to Moses who acted as mediator between God and the Jewish people is not admitted by several modern critics represented especially by Lietzmann [1] and A. Loisy [2]. According to these μεσίτης is to be understand in the sense of an interpreter, an organ, as it were, of a plurality, which plurality, they say, refers to the angels. Hence also, strictly speaking, the Law was given not by God but by the angels. That their argument is false will become evident after a few considerations. In the first place, it is not only opposed to common sense in so far as it assumes that a single person cannot make use of an intermediary, but it is also contrary to the etymology and usage of the word (cf. Dt. v, 5 ; Lev. xxvi, 46). Again, according to the solution proposed, v. 20 would either become a tautalogy or an absurdity ; for if v. 20 should merely say that the Law emanated from a plurality i. e. that it was manifested by the ministry of angels, this would be a repetition of what was said before ; but should it conclude that the Law was therefore not the work of God who is One, it would go counter to the faith of all Israel and of Saint Paul himself. Διαταγεὶς δι' ἀγγέλων, moreover, cannot be taken in the sense of " exacted by the authority of the angels ", since διὰ necessarily indicates a subordinate action [3].

1. *An die Galater*, p. 244, the author thus exposes his theory : " Geht man von v. 20 aus, so wird man aus diesem Verse folgern : der μεσίτης ist οὐκ ἑνός, ἀλλὰ πολλῶν ὁ δὲ θεὸς εἷς ἐστίν : folglich ὁ μεσίτης οὐκ ἐστί θεοῦ, ἀλλὰ πολλῶν d. h. er vertritt nicht Gott sondern eine Mehrheit, also nach v. 19 die Engel. Es ist dann aus der Tatsache, dass bei der Gesetzgebung ein μεσίτης fungierte, erschlossen, dasz das Gesetz nicht von einer Persönlichkeit (Gott) sondern einer Vielheit (den Engel) herrührt, also nicht absolut göttlich ist. Dann wäre vorauszusetzen, dass μεσίτης ' Wortführer ' heisst (was ja wirklich der Fall ist) und dass Paulus annehme, ein ' Wortführer ' vertrete niemals eine Einzelperson, sondern eine Mehrheit : was faktisch nicht richtig ist. In diesem anzunehmenden Irrtum oder flüchtigen Versehen des Paulus liegt die Schwierigkeit dieser letzteren, mir warscheinlicheren Erklärung unsrer Stelle ".

2. *L'Épître aux Galates*, p. 156, speaks in similar terms.

3. According to Zahn, *Der Brief des Paulus an die Galater*, p. 177, Moses was not so much a mediator between God and the people, a role which he says was performed by the angels, but a representative of a plurality ; by this plurality he understands not the angels but the Israelites. This interpretation like the above is contrary to the Scriptural acceptation of μεσίτης, and, in addition, renders difficult the explanation of the inferiority of the Law.

As we have said above, the Law was of the nature of a contract between two parties, God on the one hand, and the Jewish people on the other. It was valid only so long as both parties fulfilled the contract. If we now compare the Law with the promise, the inferiority of the former becomes evident. The promise is a testament, the Law a contract ; the promise is absolute, the Law contingent and conditional ; the promise comes directly from God, the Law is promulgated by a mediator ; the promise is confirmed by God with an oath, the Law is transmitted by angels ; the promise is immutable, the Law susceptible of abrogation ; the promise made without restriction is eternal, the Law made under reservation to the promise is temporary ; the promise engages the fidelity of God in an absolute manner, the Law only according to the measure of the fidelity of the people. All this is summarized in the concise form : " A mediator is not of one. " Wherever a mediator intervenes there is a bilateral contract which, subordinated to two different wills, can be revoked. But in the promise made by God without restriction or condition " God is one ". No one can modify His irrevocable decision, and He owes to Himself not to withdraw it to the detriment of those concerned. Hence it follows that the Law coming after the promise could neither abolish nor change the latter.

Since Saint Paul refers the promise rather than Law to the One God, the question naturally arises, " was the law then against the promises of God " (Gal. III, 21). Was the Legal dispensation a mere reaction, a retrogression from the promise ? Not in the Apostle's premises, but in those of his opponents did this consequence ensue. It is they who set the two at variance by trying to make Law do the work of grace : " For if there had been a law given which could give life, verily justice should have been by the law " (Gal. III, 21). That justice and life are not of the Law the Apostle has abundantly shown (Gal. II, 16 ; III, 10-13). Had the Law provided some efficient means of its own for winning justice, there would have been a conflict between the two principles. But as matters stand there is none ; Law and promise move on different planes and their functions are distinct.

We can well imagine that the Judaizer would now urge the question, τί οὖν ὁ νόμος, why then was the Law (Gal. III, 19) ? The Apostle says that it brings neither justice nor

blessing but only a curse, that the covenant made with Abraham is superior to it and does not admit of being in any way qualified by its provisions. How then can the doctrine of justification by faith and the supremacy of the Abrahamic covenant be reconciled with the divine commission given to Moses? How can the displacement of the Law by the Gospel be justified if the former too was authorized by God? Can the same God have given two contrasted revelations of Himself? In answer the Apostle tells us that the design of the Law was to mediate between the promise and its fulfilment. Its purpose was to deepen the knowledge of sin and multiply transgressions in order that grace might do its office. The disease of sin had to be brought to a head before the remedy could take effect. The legal economy is therefore ancillary and its office accessory to that of the promise. It is this positive function of the Law that we shall now consider in the following pages.

IV. THE LAW NOT A MEANS OF JUSTIFICATION. — PSYCHOLOGICAL ARGUMENTS.

A. *The Law a Cause of the Knowledge of Sin.*

Saint Paul because of his marvellous insight into human nature saw more clearly than any of his contemporaries how utterly helpless was the Jew in the presence of the Law and how strong was the domination of Sin over the flesh. In spite of this their great privilege, the possession of the Law, the Jews were found to be equally sinners with the Gentiles. In fact, through their Scriptures and their history the Jews had the Law of God made real to them with a vividness to which no other nation presents a parallel, and hence it is in Jewish, not in ethnic religious literature, that we find the consciousness of sin most acute. Hence Saint Paul is led to formulate certain propositions which must have sounded like sheer blasphemy to the ears of the Pharisaic Christians.

Far from considering the Law as an instrument of justice, Saint Paul in the first place says that through the Law came the full and adequate knowledge of sin: διὰ γὰρ νόμου ἐπίγνωσις ἁμαρτίας (Rom. III, 20). A statement like this seems at first sight paradoxical and enigmatical indeed. If the Apostle were

speaking here of the natural law, his assertions would be more intelligible since it is by this law that man distinguishes between good and evil. But Saint Paul has the Mosaic Law in view, and says that it created the consciousness of sin [1] and of inordinate concupiscence which as a desire of an illicit thing is the essence of every sin [2] : τὴν ἁμαρτίαν οὐκ ἔγνων εἰ μὴ διὰ νόμου· τὴν τε γὰρ ἐπιθυμίαν οὐκ ἤδειν εἰ μὴ ὁ νόμος ἔλεγεν οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις (Rom. VII, 7). It was by the Law that the Jew came to realize that he was under the domination of the power of Sin and of concupiscence, and that he came to know that the evil desires which arose in him together with his other natural appetites were opposed to the Divine Will. Without the Law there is indeed sin in the world, since the pagan can violate the natural moral law, the preformation of the Mosaic Law in his conscience ; but the Jew, for whom the natural law was blended with the positive from his early childhood, came to know sin only by the Law. Without the Law there would thus be no transgression, which is a violation not only of the natural but also of the positive written law, which is therefore the more heinous, and merits the greater wrath.

In this connection it might be asked, does not Saint Paul apparently contradict himself when in Rom. IV, 15 he says : " Where there is no law there is no transgression (οὗ δὲ οὐκ ἔστιν νόμος οὐδὲ παράβασις), while in Rom. II, 12 he states : " For whosoever have sinned without the law, shall perish without the law " (Ὅσοι γὰρ ἀνόμως ἥμαρτον ἀνόμως καὶ ἀπολοῦνται). In answer it is to be noted that when Saint Paul says that the Gentiles who sinned without the Law of

1. If it be objected that in the absence of the Mosaic Law the natural law would have produced the same result, it is to be answered that Saint Paul is not here concerned with this hypothesis. In Rom. II, 11-15 the Apostle showed with sufficient clearness that the pagans even by means of the natural law only could have and did come to a knowledge of their inordinate concupiscences. But for the Jew the natural law is blended with the positive. And the Apostle says that he did not know sin save by the law, and by " law " he means the Mosaic code. The Jewish child knew the Law by heart before comprehending it, and the Law gained control of him at the precise moment when his conscience began to awake. Cf. CORNELY, *Epistola ad Romanos*, p. 361.

2. ST THOMAS in Rom. VII, 7 (ed. c. vol. I, p. 95) : " Concupiscentia prava communiter se habet ad omnia peccata... Potest autem intelligi quod concupiscentia sit generale peccatum secundum quod sumitur pro concupiscentia rei illicitæ quæ est de essentia cuiuslibet peccati ".

Moses shall perish without this Law, he does not thereby wish to affirm that the Gentiles have sinned without any law. The heathen have transgressed the law of their reason, which Saint Paul considered as a preformation of the Mosaic Law, promulgated in their hearts and enabling them to accomplish the essential precepts of the Law (Rom. II, 14, 15).

Again, some see a contradiction between Rom. V, 13 : " For until the law sin was in the world, but sin was not imputed when the law was not " (ἄχρι γὰρ νόμου ἁμαρτία ἦν ἐν κόσμῳ, ἁμαρτία δὲ οὐκ ἐλλογεῖται μὴ ὄντος νόμου) and Rom. VII, 7, 8 : " But I do not know sin but by the law... for without the law sin was dead " (ἀλλὰ τὴν ἁμαρτίαν οὐκ ἔγνων εἰ μὴ διὰ νόμου... χωρὶς γὰρ νόμου ἁμαρτία νεκρά). In the solution of this difficulty it is to be remarked that although both passages refer unquestionably to the Mosaic Law, V, 13 refers to the condition of humanity before the Law, while VII, 7, 8, refer to the condition of the Jew subjected to this same Law. In the former passage Saint Paul says that during the period which elapsed from Adam to the promulgation of the Law of Moses men committed actual sins ; but these sins were not imputed (Rom. V, 14) because there was no positive divine law imposing the penalty of death on actual sin ; there was only the natural moral law whose violation was imputed but not unto physical death. In VII, 7, 8, on the other hand, the Apostle is describing the psychological experience of a Jewish boy. For the Israelite not to know the Mosaic Law was likewise not to know the natural law since he was from the very awakening of his moral conscience instructed and directed by the Law. Hence Saint Paul could say that before the precept of the Law came Sin was dead. It was only when he began to exercise his reason that Sin took advantage of the commandment and seduced him to commit actual sin (Rom. VII, 11).

B. *The Law a Cause of the Multiplication of Sin.*

Not only however did the Law bring a full consciousness of sin, but it also stimulated and increased sin. Where there was no Law neither was there transgression : οὐκ δὲ οὐκ ἔστιν νόμος, οὐδὲ παράβασις (Rom. IV, 15). But when the Law as a sort of secondary stage in the Divine plan came in, sins were

indefinitely multiplied : νόμος δὲ παρεισῆλθεν ἵνα πλεονάσῃ τὸ παράπτωμα (Rom. v, 20) ; τί οὖν ὁ νόμος· τῶν παραβάσεων χάριν προσετέθη (Gal. iii, 19). Thereafter there were not only breaches of the natural law but also violations of a written express commandment. And the Law multiplied these transgressions because by a psychological fact, which Saint Paul here exhibits with marvellous insight into human nature, the very existence of a commandment acts as an incitement to its violation [1].

Without the Law ἡ ἁμαρτία, the power of sin personified, was powerless and inactive. It had nothing to work upon, no means of producing guilt (Rom. vii, 9). In the Law however it found the *point d'appui*, the very opportunity it wanted. And so by the help of the express command Sin caused all kinds of conscious and sinful covetousness : ἀφορμὴν δὲ λαβοῦσα ἡ ἁμαρτία διὰ τῆς ἐντολῆς κατειργάσατο ἐν ἐμοι πᾶσαν ἐπιθυμίαν (Rom. vii, 8, 11). Thus the Law became the stronghold of Sin, its tool and active instrument : ἡ δὲ δύναμις τῆς ἁμαρτίας ὁ νόμος (I Cor. xv, 56), or as Saint Thomas says : *virtus peccati dicitur lex, inquantum scilicet per legem occasionaliter est peccatum augmentatum, et quasi ad maximum suum posse pervenit.*[2]

It might here be asked in what sense was it the purpose and effect of the Law to multiply sin ? Did the Law increase sin merely in men's consciousness of it, i. e., subjectively, or did it also increase sin actually and objectively ? That the Law reveals certain acts as sinful and in this sense augments the number of transgressions is clear from what we have said

1. Many interesting classical parallels might here be quoted in illustration of this fact :

Liv. xxxiv, 4 : Parricidæ cum lege cœperunt, et illis facinus pœna monstravit.

Sen. *De Clem.* i, 13 : Genus humanum ruit per vetitum et nefas.

Hor. i, 3 : Quod licet ingratum est, quod non licet acrius est.

Ovid, *Amor.* ii, 19 : The law produces reflection on the forbidden object, curiosity, doubt, distrust, imagination, lust, susceptibility of the seed of temptation and of seduction, and finally rebellion — the παράβασις (Lange).

Metam. vii, 19 : Aliudque cupido, mens aliud suadet ; video meliora proboque, deteriora sequor.

Cf. Prat, o. c. vol. I[9], pp. 270-279, Pesch, *Praelectiones dogmaticae*, vol. V, p. 294. Lagrange *Épître aux Galates* p. 82 Garvie, *Studies of Paul and His Gospel*, p. 200 ff., Löwy, art. *Die Paulinische Lehre vom Gesetz*, MGWJ, 1903, pp. 422-433 Juncker *Die Ethik des Apostels Paulus*, p. 59, Scott, *The Spirit in the New Testament*, pp. 161-165, Kennedy, *The Theology of the Epistles*, pp. 41-49.

2. *Sum. Theol.* I[a], II[æ], q. 55, a. 3, ad 1[um].

above. But the Law also rouses sinful desires which before were latent in men. The Sin, ἡ ἁμαρτία, which was " dead ", is roused to activity and manifestation, is developed into open opposition to the Law, and is brought out into actual transgression. This actual effect of the Law in increasing the expression of sin in open transgression Saint Paul declares to be the very purpose of the Law : " The law entered in that (ἵνα) sin might abound " (Rom. v, 20), and " was set because of transgressions " (τῶν παραβάσεων χάριν, Gal. III, 19) [1]. The purpose of the Law was that ἡ ἁμαρτία might be brought out in the character of παράβασις, and its latent and deadly power thus shown ; that the παράπτωμα, the open transgression of Law, might reveal the depth and danger of the sinful principle of which it was the expression, in order that men might seek deliverance from its power by the grace of Jesus Christ.

For the Law was inert, cold, and passive. It was indeed a light to our feet and a guide to our path, it pointed severely to the road of right and duty, but there its function ended. It stood in history as a monument condemning the wrong, but it accomplished nothing more. It gave no force and strength for the performance of that which it required, it afforded no remedy against concupiscence subverting reason. Nay, by a strange perversity in human nature it seemed actually to lead to sin, for the very fact that a thing was forbidden made it the more attractive. And the better and fuller the law, the more glaring was the contrast to the practise of those who lived under it. The Jews were at the head of mankind in their privileges but morally they were equally sinners with the Gentiles. As a code of commandments, therefore, the Mosaic Law did all that it was intended to do, but it needed to be supplemented. And it was this supplementing which Christianity brought, and thereby set the Law in its true light and proper place in the economy of salvation.

1. As to the force of *ut* (ἵνα) the more probable opinion is that of CORNELY, *Epistola ad Romanos*, pp. 304-305, who in commenting on Rom. v, 20 says : " qua in sententia particulam ἵνα (ut) non ἐκβατικῶς (de rei eventu i. q. ita ut)... sed certo quodam sensu τελικῶς (de rei consilio i. q. eo fine ut) esse sumen dam, aliis ex locis paulinis abunde constat ". So too the χάριν of Gal. III, 19 is to be interpreted in a similar manner.

C. *The Law a Cause of Wrath and of Death.*

Finally, by enhancing the guilt of sin the Law only served to bring down God's wrath : ὁ γὰρ νόμος ὀργὴν κατεργάζεται (Rom. IV, 5). It worked wrath because it forced sin prominently before man's consciousness and thus made it the source of acute misery. It brought home to man's conscience that sense of guilt which is the feeling of disharmony with God. It darkened life with the shadows of dread and self-contempt by creating the sense of moral death and by giving to physical death its deadliest sting. Not that the Law positively commanded anything which would make those who observed it worthy of divine anger ; yet because it commanded and failed to give grace for its fulfilment, transgressions increased and with them God's wrath. Moreover, the commandment furnished the very opportunity which Sin required to acquire fresh life, and in consequence led to death : " For without the law sin was dead... But when the commandment came, sin revived and I died. For sin taking occasion by the commandment, seduced me and by it killed me " (Rom. VII, 8, 9, 11). And so the commandment which was holy in its origin, just in its requirements, good in its purpose, which was given to point out to men the way of life, that very commandment was found to lead o death : καὶ εὑρέθη μοι ἡ ἐντολὴ ἡ εἰς ζωήν, αὕτη εἰς θάνατον (Rom. VII, 10).

The regime of the Law therefore is a regime of malediction, and those who rely solely on the works of the Law cannot but eventually amass for themselves the wrath of God : Ὅσοι γὰρ ἐξ ἔργων νόμου εἰσίν, ὑπὸ κατάραν εἰσίν (Gal. III, 10). The Law itself confirms this since it curses anyone who does not accomplish all its precepts : ἐπικατάρατος πᾶς ὃς οὐκ ἐμμένει πᾶσιν τοῖς γεγραμμένοις ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τοῦ νόμου τοῦ ποιῆσαι αὐτά (Gal. III, 10). Its menace, the malediction of God, which is not only an external manifestation of His wrath but a permanent state of hostility, is directed against all who infringe even a single article. Though Saint Paul does not say that those who rely on the works of the Law are accursed, yet it is evident that they place themselves on a ground where they run the risk of certainly being cursed. For the Law did not confer the energy and force necessary for the accomplishment of what

it commanded ; it only placed the evil in evidence and thereby multiplied transgressions.

We have briefly outlined above the disastrous workings of the Law. We have seen that the Law deepened the knowledge of sin, multiplied transgressions and brought in its train wrath and death. What then was the cause of this failure of the Law, how explain that the " commandment that was ordained to life, the same was found to be unto death " (Rom. VII, 10) ? The Jews, it might here be noted, attributed man's moral inability to accomplish the good proposed by the Law to the presence in man of an evil inclination, the יֵצֶר הָרַע, which impels man to sin. The universality of sin which had penetrated the conscience of entire Palestinian Judaism was undoubtedly attributed to the sin of Adam, but Jewish theology is not explicit as to what exactly was the nature and effects of the Genesiac sin [1]. However it was precisely to overcome the יֵצֶר הָרַע, that God had given to man the Law, which was to be for the Jew the strong arm of combat, the instrument of justice, the way of salvation. But the pious Jew did not arrive at consciousness of his justice, and this economy of salvation did not give him rest and repose. For along with Pharisaic pride and confidence in his own justice, there existed also the feeling of helplessness and the consciousness of sin [2]. The yoke of the Law was heavy to carry, and the judgments of God rigorous and exacting. As the Apostle Saint Paul himself recognizes, the transgressions of the Law which seemed inevitable and the daily sins which were innumerable, were accumulating wrath for the great day of the judgment of God.

D. *The Law in Its Relation to the Flesh*

The reason for the impossibility of obtaining justice by the Law Saint Paul finds in the flesh as this is influenced by Sin. The lusts of the flesh, its vices and concupiscences, not only weaken but positively hinder man in his attempt to do good :

---

1. Cf. TIXERONT, *Histoire des dogmes*, vol. I, p. 38, LAGRANGE, *Épître aux Romains*, pp. 114-118, SANDAY AND HEADLAM, o. c. p. 136.

2. Cf. TOBAC, o. c. pp. 1-20, JUNCKER, o. c. pp. 16-18, SCHÜRER, *Geschichte des Judischen Volkes*[3], p. 491 ff.

" For the flesh lusteth against the spirit, and the spirit against the flesh, for these are contrary one to another " (Gal. v, 17). The tendencies of the flesh are hostile to God and lead to death (Rom. viii, 6, 7). In times past, says the Apostle, we all conversed in the desires of the flesh and fulfilled its will (Eph. ii, 3). These concupiscences continually drag man to the inferior good and to a life " according to the flesh " : " They that are according to the flesh, mind the things that are of the flesh " (Rom. viii, 5). Because of his carnal body man is continually drawn to earthly things, in a direction opposite to that of the spirit.

As a result of the concupiscences of the flesh man is not only driven to perform evil deeds, but is actually enslaved to the power of Sin. In his body Sin holds active sway, having continually at its disposition the passions and desires of the flesh. In the internal struggle between the two constitutive elements of man's being the intellectual is very often vanquished. But whence, we might ask, comes this perversity of human nature ? Saint Paul in answer leads us back to the historical cause of this disorder : " By one man sin entered into this world " (Rom. v, 12), and " by the disobedience of one many were made sinners " (Rom. v, 19). The action of a single individual, as we have amply shown above, brought all mankind under the dominion of Sin, and made all men sinners.

Hence while Saint Paul recognized that the Law was spiritual, he at the same time knew that he was a weak creature, mere flesh and blood, sold into slavery to Sin : " For we know that the law is spiritual, but I am carnal, sold under sin " and " there dwelleth not in me, that is to say, in my flesh, that which is good " (Rom. vii, 14, 18). " With the mind " the Apostle again says, " I serve the law of God, but with the flesh, the law of sin " (Rom. vii, 25), for " I see another law in my members, fighting against the law of my mind, and captivating me in the law of sin, that is in my members " (Rom. vii, 23). His better self, therefore, his conscience and reason, endorse the Law of God, but according to the flesh he is enslaved to the Sin entrenched in his physical nature and is unable to fulfil that same Law [1].

---

1. Cf. Bartmann, *St. Paulus und St. Jacobus über die Rechtfertigung*, BS, 1897, p. 38 ff.

Hence we can now easily explain certain statements of Saint Paul which at first sight seem contradictory and which have offered so much difficulty to exegetes. In itself the Law was ἅγιος and πνευματικός, the commandment δικαία and ἀγαθή : the Law was holy and spiritual in its origin, just in its requirements, and good in its purpose (Rom. VII, 12, 14 ; I Tim. I, 8) It was given to lead to justice and life, ἡ ἐντολὴ ἡ εἰς ζωήν (Rom. VII, 10 ; X, 5). On the last day those who had observed the Law will be declared just, οἱ ποιηταὶ νόμου δικαιωθήσονται (Rom. II, 13 ; X, 5 ; Gal. III, 12). It was ordained by angels with Moses as mediator (Gal. III, 19). It was one of the great privileges of Israel (Rom. IX, 4). It conducted men to Christ, παιδαγωγὸς ἡμῶν γέγονεν εἰς Χριστόν (Gal. III, 24), Who was its end and fulfilment (Rom. X, 4). In fact, to summarize all its eulogies, it was the Law of God (Rom. VII, 22-25 ; VIII, 7).

In and of itself the Law deserved all these praises of Saint Paul. Had it been proposed to man before Sin gained dominion over him, it would have retained intact all its high prerogatives. And even if it could have been observed after the fall it would have led to justice. But Saint Paul clearly saw that fallen humanity was helpless in the presence of the Law. Hence far from being an instrument of justice, it " brought nothing to perfection " (Heb. VII, 19). It could only lead to a knowledge and increase of sin without giving the strength for the accomplishment of what it commanded. It became an active instrument of sin, and thus worked wrath and led to death. Its ideal content, the will of God, was indeed justice and life, but its exterior form, the γράμμα, which limited itself solely to dictating and commanding, was the " letter that killeth " and the " ministration of death " (II Cor. III, 6, 7).

Nevertheless, it might still be maintained that we are after all in presence of two contradictory propositions in the Pauline Epistles : on the one hand we have the statement that the Law was not given to save but to deepen the knowledge of sin and intensify its power, and on the other the principle that the Law if observed would justify and save. In fact the Apostle says that " the man that shall do it shall live by it " (Rom. X, 5) and that " he that doth those things shall live in them " (Gal. III, 12). Again in Rom. II, 13 he says that " not the hearers of the law are just before God, but the doers of the law shall be justified ", in order that his readers may understand

how rigorous are the terms on which justification by merit is to be obtained, and how fruitless will be the effort since nothing less than a complete obedience will avail (cf. Gal. III, 10). Here again we must remark that abstractly considered, complete obedience to the Law's requirements would entitle one to salvation; yet in concrete fact salvation is not attainable in this way because of the power of Sin in all men. All who have been saved in Old Testament times, as well as since, have been saved by faith and grace as was Abraham. Though practically the Law cannot justify, this fact results from no fault of its own; the Apostle attributes no moral defect to it, he does not question it as a perfect standard and rule of life, and maintains, as said above, the abstract possibility of salvation by it if perfect obedience were rendered. But the Apostle differed radically from the Jewish view on the question of fact, whether such obedience is or ever can be rendered.

And if it still be urged that the Law cannot have been meant to accomplish what *de facto* it never does, we would note that this fact does not preclude its usefulness in warning men against the consequences of sin and in operating as a check against evil actions. The Law might intensify sin in one sense even while restraining it in another; the Law's restraining power operates in the sphere of action, its function of increasing sin is exercised in the sphere of consciousness.

The Law then may be said to conduct to life, but only indirectly in that it is one of the agencies by which men are taught their need of Christ and led to seek His aid. For, after having proved that the inheritance depended on faith and not on works of the Law, Saint Paul immediately asks the question: " why then was the law " τί οὖν ὁ νόμος (Gal. III, 19). And in answer he says: " it was set because of transgressions, τῶν παραβάσεων χάριν προσετέθη. The same idea is stated even more expressly in Rom. V, 20: " the law entered in that sin might abound ", νόμος δὲ παρεισῆλθεν ἵνα πλεονάσῃ τὸ παράπτωμα.

Without the Law, says Saint Paul, Sin was " dead ", i. e. inactive (Rom. VII, 8). But when the Law came, ἡ ἁμαρτία found in it the very *point d'appui* to produce actual sin and so lead to death (Rom. VII, 8, 11). But why we ask did God permit this strange perversion of so excellent a thing as the Law? In answer Saint Paul says that this very perversion

served to aggravate the horror of Sin : ἀλλὰ ἡ ἁμαρτία ἵνα φανῇ ἁμαρνία, διὰ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ μοι κατεργαζομένη θάνατον (Rom. VII, 13). Not content with the evil which it is in itself Sin must needs turn to evil that which was at once beneficent in its purpose and divine in its origin. By making use of a good instrument to work out upon man the doom of death, Sin showed its true colors, was convicted of being the pernicious thing it was, and showed to the world of what perversity and extremities it was capable. It was necessary that the culpability of Sin might be established in order that it might be the object of a sentence.

Furthermore, when Saint Paul says that the Law came in that sin might be multiplied and recognized as such, the purpose is conceived as God's. Not that God proposed transgressions to Himself as an end, but He could permit them and place a cause that would multiply them in a design known to Himself alone and which Saint Paul indicates in Gal. III, 22 : " But the scripture hath concluded all under sin that the promise, by the faith of Jesus Christ, might be given to them that believe ". The Law held man in custody under sin that all avenues to justice might be closed to him till the appearance of Christ. This bondage, this fruitless struggle against sin, this defeat and the acknowledgment of his absolute sinfulness, would press man to cry for deliverance and salvation. It is as though God saw that the only way to make man accept His justice was to make him despair of his own, and the only way to make him despair of his own was to subject him to a discipline under which the Sin that was in him would reveal all its sinfulness, all its tyrannical strength, and annihilate all his hopes ; so that " where sin abounded grace might the more abound " (Rom. V, 20) [1].

The Law therefore had its place in the economy of salvation. Being unable to confer any of the blessings which were the object

1. ST. THOMAS, Ia IIae q. XCVIII, a. 2, ad 3um. says : " Deus aliquando permittit aliquos cadere in peccatum, ut exinde humilientur; ita etiam voluit talem legem dare, quam suis viribus homines implere non possent ; ut sic, dum homines præsumentes de se, peccatores se invenirent, humiliati recurrerent ad auxilium gratiæ ". Similarly in q. LXXIX, a. 4, ad 1um.: " omnia mala, quæ Deus facit, vel permittit fieri, ordinantur ad aliquod bonum ; non tamen semper in bonum ejus, in quo est malum ; sed quandoque ad bonum alterius vel etiam totius universi ".

of the promises (Gal. III, 21), it was not contrary to the latter. But it played a negative role in the preparation for the realisation of the promise. In manifesting to man his helplessness, rendering him conscious of his sin, and placing before his eyes the punishments which awaited him, it disposed him to expect and receive salvation solely by faith and divine mercy [1]. This particular purpose and role of the Law the Apostle finally brings out in two comparisons which he employs in his epistle to the Galatians, that of the jailer and that of the pedagogue.

V. THE LAW A JAILER AND A PEDAGOGUE.

According to Saint Paul the Scripture makes of the world one vast prison house with the Law as jailer and mankind held fast in the chains of sin waiting for death. In this position the Apostle had once found himself (Rom. VII, 24 ; VIII, 2), and in his own heart he saw only one example of the universal sinfulness of mankind : " Every mouth was stopped, and all the world brought in guilty before God " (Rom. III, 19). This condition the Apostle graphically describes in Gal. III, 23 : " Before the faith came, we were kept under the law shut up, unto that faith which was to be revealed ". The Law was continually standing guard over its subjects, watching and checking every attempt to escape, but intending to hand them over in due time to the charge of faith. It prevented the sinner from escaping to a futile and illusive freedom. And where the Law did its work well, it produced, as in the earlier experience of Saint Paul, a profound sense of personal demerit, a tenderness of conscience, and a contrition of heart which makes one ready to receive with gratitude the free gift of the justice of God which is by faith.

In order to bring out more clearly this idea that under the Mosaic legal system we were held in custody and under tutelage Saint Paul exchanges the metaphor of the jailer for that of

1. Thus GRAFE, *Die paulinische Lehre vom Gesetz*[2], p. 17 says : " Durch diese Erfahrung aber, die der Mensch mit dem Gesetz an sich macht, soll er genöthigt werden, an der Möglichkeit alles eigenen Thuns zur Erreichung der Gerechtigkeit zu verzweifeln... Und in diesem Sinne kann man dem Gesetz eine negative Vorbereitung auf die neutestamentliche Gnadenordnung zuschreiben ". Cf. PRAT, o. c. vol. I[9], pp. 214-218, 270-279 ; JUNCKER, o. c. pp. 58-64.

the pedagogue or tutor : ὁ νόμος παιδαγωγὸς ἡμῶν γέγονεν εἰς Χριστόν, ἵνα ἐκ πίστεως δικαιωθῶμεν (Gal. III, 24 ; cf. Rom. VII, 4, 6 ; X, 4). The pedagogue was a trusted slave, whose office it was to watch over the child of his master, correct and punish it, and accompany it to the teacher. His often inflexible probity, while it might serve to form character, frequently contributed to make the child desire adolescence. His office, however, was quite distinct from that of the διδάσκαλος, so that the English rendering " schoolmaster " conveys a wrong idea. The metaphor of the pedagogue seems to have grown out of ἐφρουρούμεθα of v. 23 (πρὸ τοῦ δὲ ἐλθεῖν τὴν πίστιν, ὑπὸ νόμον ἐφρουρούμεθα συνκλειόμενοι), and thus the main idea is that of strict supervision and complete dependency. Whether the parents relied upon the good example and influence of the pedagogue, or whether the latter ever incited his subject to sin, are questions which Saint Paul does not consider. He regards the institution solely from its formal side as a discipline imposed upon the child who is thereby maintained in a state of servitude. When his protégé reached the age of manhood and put on the *toga virilis* the duty of the pedagogue ceased [1].

When the metaphor is applied to the Law it merges into that of the jailer, and the Apostle says that in like manner those of Jewish descent were during the spiritual infancy of the world, before the appearance of Christianity, kept shut under the Law as prisoners. The Law held them in bondage, it was their guardian, it corrected and punished them. But its function like that of the pedagogue was temporary ; it was to exist until Christ should come [2]. In baptism we as it were reached the age of spiritual manhood, and laying aside the dress of childhood, the former self, " put on Christ " (Col. III, 9 ; Eph. IV, 22-24). We were made members of Christ's mystical

---

1. For illustrations of the use of the term παιδαγωγὸς cf. CICERO, *De amic.* 20, SENECA, *de ira* II, 22, HERODOTUS, VIII, 75, EURIPIDES. *Elect.* 288, *Jon.* 725. Cf. also OSWALD, art. Τί οὖν ὁ νόμος ; *Verhältnis vom Gesetz, Sünde, und Evangelium, nach Gal.* 3 ", THSK, 1902, pp. 26-56, FERRARI, o. c. pp. 164-172.

2. According to LIGHTFOOT, *Epistle to the Galatians*, p. 149 : " The tempting explanation of παιδαγωγὸς εἰς Χριστὸν, ' one to conduct us to the school of Christ ' ought probably to be abandoned. Even if this sense did not require πρὸς Χριστὸν or εἰς Χριστὸν, the context is unfavorable to it. There is no reference here to our Lord as teacher ". Christ is represented in the whole

body, and we were all made one (Rom. VI, 3). Salvation is now open to all on the same condition without distinction of race or sex. As Christians we all constitute the true posterity of Abraham, the spiritual Israel ; we are all the children of God and heirs, chosen to inherit the blessings promised to Abraham (Rom. II, 28, 29 ; IV, 11, 16, 24 ; IX, 6-13).

In view of the many diverse interpretations which have been proposed in regard to the paedagogium of the Law, and in view of the frequent lack of a definite statement in many commentaries, it seems necessary to consider further what Saint Paul exactly meant when he said ὁ νόμος παιδαγωγὸς ἡμῶν εἰς Χριστόν. The office of the pedagogue, as we have said, was to maintain his pupil under strict supervision and complete dependance rather than to contribute positively to his education. So too " the law was our pedagogue in Christ, that we might be justified by faith (Gal. III, 24), but before the faith came we were kept under the law shut up, unto that faith which was to be revealed " (Gal. III, 23). This prison of the Law in which we were kept in custody, this strict servitude in which we were enclosed, was the servitude of sin. Saint Paul formulates these two propositions as absolutely parallel : " the scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise, by the faith of Jesus Christ, might be given to them that believe " (Gal. III, 22), and " we were kept under the law shut up, unto that faith which was to be revealed " (Gal. III, 23). The paedagogium of the Law therefore consisted in holding man in custody and in bondage under sin, so that all avenues to justice might be closed to him, and that he might thus dispose himself to receive salvation by faith and divine mercy (Gal. III, 24) [1].

In Gal. IV, 2 the pedagogue of the previous section reappears as a " tutor " and " governor " with the rudiments of the world in his hand. These " elements of the world " form a system of elementary religious teaching under which the young heir

epistle as the Redeemer, as the object of our faith. Cf. LAGRANGE, *Épître aux Galates*, pp.90-91.

1. According to PRAT, o. c. vol. I[9], p. 219 : " La foi par la rigueur de ses préceptes faisait désirer le libérateur ; par ses prophéties de plus en plus claires, elle permet de le reconnaître d'avance ; elle y préparait les cœurs en les maintenant presque malgré eux, dans le monothéisme ; c'est ainsi qu'elle conduisait au Christ qui est son terme et sa fin ". These functions may indeed be attributed to the Law but they are not those which Saint Paul wishes to express by the comparison with the pedagogue. Cf. LAGRANGE, o. c. p. 90 f., GRAFE, o. c. p. 17.

was schooled up to the time of his majority The Law was thus an education for Christianity, a preparation for the coming of the Redeemer. For its moral regimen deepened the conviction and bondage of sin and multiplied its overt acts ; its ceremonial impressed on sensuous natures the idea of Divine holiness ; and its sacrificial rites, though they failed indeed to remove sin but rather awakened the need and sustained the hope of its removal, gave definiteness to men's conception of the Redemption. Thus it may truly be said that " the end of the law is Christ " (Rom. x, 4).

Before proceeding to the next point let us briefly indicate the results we have so far attained in our study. By a regressive method we have traced the genesis of the universality of sin. We have found that Adam's transgression was due at least indirectly to Satan. As a result of this primitive fall Sin lodged itself in the flesh and the Law is now at its service. The spirit-powers who were active in introducing evil into the world, continue even now by obscuring men's minds and by fomenting the passions of the flesh to be faithful auxiliaries of Sin. The question that now suggests itself is, what were the consequences of this universal state of sin ?

CHAPTER III.

The Reign of Sin.

Art. I. — HUMANITY UNDER DIVINE WRATH.

An immediate and natural consequence of sin is to render man an enemy of God, i. e., it provokes divine wrath The Pauline conception of God's ὀργή is one that can be adequately expressed and understood only in terms of the Biblical conception of his Holiness. Holiness in the Old Testament may be said to be a comprehensive name for the divine moral perfection ; the special moral attributes which it yields may be conveniently grouped under justice and love, though in reality both are expressions of the one undivided Life. Holiness, moreover, is not a passive perfection of the Divine Being but a vital active principle asserting itself in the upholding of the good and in the condemnation and judgment of the bad : " Our God is a consuming fire " (Heb. xii, 29). Yet the ultimate end of holiness is not the destruction of the sinner but his restoration and life (Eph iv, 13-17 ; Col. iii, 10).

It is true of course that Pauline texts referring to God's Holiness occur less frequently than similar passages in the Old Testament. The sacred writers of the Old Dispensation were, so to say, nourished on the idea of the Divine Holiness. This attribute for them constituted the very essence of Jahveh, and established His moral perfection and superiority over the gods of paganism. Moreover, the ancient alliance was destined above all to proclaim Jahveh's repulsion for evil, and His hatred of sin was often confirmed by severe punishments inflicted upon transgressors of the Law. The Israelites were thus led to feel the contrast between the Holy God and sinful humanity, and thereby better to understand the need of a Redemption. The Apostles, though in no wise sacrificing the Holiness of God, which was for them an accepted axiom, to His mercy, exalted in preference the Divine Love whose supreme manifestation they could now contemplate in the Person of the Redeemer. Yet the New Testament and the Pauline Epistles

are not entirely silent on the question of God's Holiness. Just as the Israelites, in order to be members of the chosen people, were to observe scrupulously all the prescriptions of the Mosaic Law, so also the Christians ought to conform their daily conduct to the requirements of the moral law ; this idea is implicitly contained in the title, saints, ἅγιοι, which the Apostle ordinarily attributes to the members of the primitive Church (Rom. I, 7 ; II Cor. I, 1 ; Phil. I, 1 ; Eph. I, 4 ; Col. I, 22). Again, if the Apostle had confounded the Holiness of God with His goodness, would he have recommended to his readers the fear of the Lord ? " With fear and trembling, he says, " work out your salvation " (Phil. II, 12).

Hence it is evident that any teaching which negates God's existence, or denies or weakens the truth of His Holiness, must in that degree also subvert the Christian conception of sin and the Redemption. Atheistic and materialistic views of the world may be set aside at once as incompatible with any serious view of sin ; here the negation of God, of the spiritual nature of man, and of moral distinctions is absolute. Again, since holiness contains the idea of a living, intelligent, free Personality it results that all pantheistic systems and theories of Idealism which exclude or inadequately affirm the Divine Personality are hostile to Christian views of sin. But it is especially in modern contemporary philosophy that not only the concept of God's Holiness but of His Divine Nature itself has been essentially and fundamentally distorted. For how can we attribute Holiness and infinite perfection to the " fighting, struggling, suffering God " of such authors as Mc. Giffert [1], Wells [2], James [3], Pringle-Pattison [4], to the " evolving *nisus* of Alexander [5], and to the " ideal of personality " of Sellars [6] ? In modern philosophy man is made the center and measure of all things ; according to its conception every man is in a sense divine, and in this pantheon of modern polytheism God is but the *primus inter pares*, Whose sole purpose is to serve the interests of man. Far other was Saint Paul's conception

1. Art. *Christianity and Democracy*, HTHR, January, 1919, p. 49.
2. *God the Invisible King* (London, 1917).
3. *A Pluralistic Unverse* (London, 1909).
4. *The Idea of God*[2] (New York, 1902).
5. *Space, Time, and Deity*, 2 vol. (London, 1920).
6. *Next Step in Religion* (New York, 1918).

of God. For him God was not only holy and righteous (Rom. I, 17, II, 5-16, III, 21-30), not only just in His rule of the universe (Rom. IX, 14; II Thess. I, 5 ; II Tim. IV, 8), but also the Creator and Lord of the universe (Rom. I, 20 ; XI, 33-36 ; Col. I, 15-19), almighty and all-wise (Rom. XI, 33 ; I Cor. II, 10 ; I Tim. I, 17), as well as supreme Love (Rom. V, 5-8 ; VIII, 35-39 ; Eph. II, 4 ; III, 17-19) [1].

Secondly, a special aspect of the Holiness of God is His retributive justice [2]. In Rom. XII, 19 the Apostle writes : " Revenge not yourselves, my dearly beloved, for it is written : Revenge is mine, I will repay, saith the Lord " (cf. I Thess. IV, 6 ; II Thess. I, 8). In the same epistle he pronounces as just the condemnation by God of the incredulous Jews (III, 8). Again, he frequently tells us that God as the just Judge is the Remunerator of good and evil works (Rom. II, 6, III, 5 ; II Tim. IV, 8). Similarly, the Pauline expression, δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ, where it is employed to designate a divine attribute denotes that essential attribute of the Divine Nature which makes God displeased at sin, and which must find expression in all treatment and condemnation of sin [3]. It comes to view in this sense in Rom. III, 25, where the thought is that since God has so long shown indulgence to sinful men in the past ages it was necessary to reveal and vindicate His justice in the work of Christ. By accomplishing a work of propitiation and of reconcilation between God and men, Christ effected a revelation of God's justice which vindicates the divine displeasure of sin and shows God to be the gracious justifier of men. This attribute of God might seem to have been in abeyance when He leniently treated the sinners of past generations (Acts XVII, 30), but it is nevertheless always operative and in accordance with it all gracious treatment of

1. Cf. GOGUEL, *L'Apôtre Paul et Jésus-Christ*, pp. 173-193.

2. PESCH, *Das Sühneleiden unseres göttlichen Erlösers*, p. 24, after comparing Divine and human justice, concludes : " Trotzdem ist in Gott Gerechtigkeit im eigentlichen Sinn des Wortes ; denn Ubereinstimmung mit dem, was recht ist, worin das Wesen der Gerechtigkeit besteht, ist eine reine Vollkommenheit und musz darum Gott zugeschrieben werden. Das gleiche gilt von der Strafgerechtigkeit ; denn dasz der Wächter des Gesetzes die freiwillige Ubertretung des Gesetzes bestraft, ist durchaus in der Ordnung und Ordnung ist Vollkommenheit ".

3. According to ZORELL, o. c. p. 136, δικαιοσύνδ θεοη in the above sense, is the " Dei modus agendi secundum normam suæ sanctitatis et sec. consilium salutis quam hominibus largiri statuit ".

sinners must be planned and executed. God's justice is not antithetic to His mercy and love, but it influences the method of their action so that in all such action His displeasure at sin must be fully revealed.

Thirdly, the actual effect of God's justice is His wrath. This divine wrath is not to be understood as an ebullition of anger and revenge, or as a disorderly impulse to repay evil with evil ; God's wrath is a holy aversion from sin, and God's vengeance is the imposition of a just penalty for the infringement of the divine commandments and of the moral law [1]. The wrath provoked by the offence implies necessarily a certain hostility of the person injured in his honour and rights against the person of the offender ; hence the formula " God hates sin but loves the sinner " has no sanction in Saint Paul [2]. For the opposition which the Apostle establishes in Rom. v, 8-10, between the state of enmity towards God and the state of reconciliation proves that he considers the sinner not only as opposed to God by his sin but also as being, by the fact of his sin, treated as an enemy by God ; the hostilities accordingly are mutual. Hence Saint Paul frequently reiterates that the wrath of God is suspended over the sinner : " The wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and injustice " (Rom. i, 18). Addressing himself directly to the sinner the Apostle says : " According to thy hardness and impenitent heart, thou treasurest up to thyself wrath, against the day of wrath and revelation of the just judgment of God who will render to every man according to his works " (Rom. ii, 5, 6). Making allusion to the Jews who fill up the measure of their sins by opposing the Gospel, Saint Paul again remarks : " The wrath of God is come upon them to the end " (I Thess. ii, 16). Similarly in the Epistles to the

---

1. Cf. Pesch, o. c. 122 ; according to Cornely, *Epistola ad Romanos*, p. 77, " Nomine *irae Dei* per anthropomorphismum quendam designari iustitiam Dei vindicativam, quo ordinem peccatis hominum perturbatum severis suis sed iustis pœnis restaurat, omnes consentiunt " ; so too Zorell, o. c. p. 399, defines the wrath of God as " Dei erga peccatum odium, a peccatore aversio, ejusque justitia vindicativa ".

2. Snowden, *The Atonement and Ourselves*, p. 84, well remarks in this regard : " The very core and essence of personality is the will, and when we sin, though there may be hesitations, yet the will as a whole has embraced sin, and so has practically associated itself with evil and passed into the sphere of things hostile to God ".

Ephesians and Colossians the Apostle affirms that it is because of their many sins that men are the objects of divine wrath (Eph. II, 3 ; V, 6 ; Col. III, 5, 6) [1].

Saint Paul connects in a very intimate manner the announcement of his Gospel and the necessity which it has to meet (Rom. I, 16-18). The revelation of the δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ is necessitated by the revelation of his wrath. Both the justice of God which constitutes the Gospel and the ὀργὴ θεοῦ to which men are exposed apart from the Gospel are spoken of as objective and real revelations. According to the Apostle wrath is revealed in a three-fold manner : firstly, as he explains in Rom. c. I, in the appalling spectacles of moral degradation which the world presents and in which we see human sin under the retributive judgment of God ; secondly, this wrath is revealed in the solemn witness of conscience that " they who do such things are worthy of death " (Rom. I, 32), in the testimony that all sin and all who identify themselves with sin must confront the sentence of God ; finally, the wrath of God is revealed particularly and especially at the consummation of history, when God will judge the world and inflict the wrath and punishment which sin has merited (I Thess. I, 10 ; Rom. II, 8 ; III, 5 ; V, 9 ; XII, 19).

In this connection Ritschl [2] labors hard to show that " wrath" in the New Testament has (as also in the Old Testament prophets) a uniformly eschatological reference, and does not apply to the present condition. He goes even further and challenges its right to a place in the Christian system, maintaining that the notion " has no religious worth for Christians, but is an unfixed and formless theologoumenon " [3]. So too J. Caird [4], because of certain speculative prepossessions seems to weaken down and explain away the conception of divine wrath. In regard to these and similar objections it might be remarked that it is no doubt true that the eschatological aspect of wrath is prominent in the New Testament and that as a consequence its actual realisation retires into the background. But indica-

1. Cf. PESCH, o. c. p. 122 ff., RIVIÈRE, *Le dogme de la rédemption*, p. 319, WORKMAN, *At Onement or Reconciliation with God*, pp. 28-29 ; KNOX, *The Glad Tidings of Reconciliation*, p. 226 ff.
2. *Rechtfertigung und Versöhnung*[4], vol. II, p. 154 ff.
3. Ibid., pp. 154-155.
4. *Introduction to the Philosophy of Religion*, p. 174 ff.

tions are not lacking in the Pauline Epistles which show that wrath is already actual (Rom. I, 18, II, 5, IX, 22 ; Eph. II, 3, 13 ; V, 6 ; Col. III, 6) [1], and that there is always in God the principle of which wrath is the exterior manifestation. And when it is urged that the attribution of wrath to God is an unworthy mode of conception and derogates from the Divine Perfection, we can only reply that a ruler of the Universe who would not be opposed to sin, and who would not put forth against it a destroying energy, would be lacking in an essential element of perfection and His justice and mercy would no longer have any substantial value [2].

Art. II. — THE REIGN OF DEATH.

I. THE PAULINE DOCTRINE CONCERNING DEATH.

Among the many painful and degrading consequences of sin the phenomenon of death is in a particular manner attributed by the Apostle to sin. Before discussing this punitive aspect of death, we would note that Saint Paul distinguishes three other kinds of death : 1) spiritual, which is used to denote the spiritual and moral atrophy of man in his unregenerate condition (Eph. II, 1, V, 14 ; Col. II, 13) ; 2) baptismal : thus when Saint Paul declares that we died to sin, that we were buried through baptism unto death (Rom. VI, 2,4), that he who has died is justified from sin (Rom. VI, 7), he speaks of a death to the penalty of sin which is possible to the Christians only because of the redeeming death of Christ endured on our behalf (cf. Rom. VI, 8 ; I Cor. XV, 3 ; II Cor. V, 14) ; 3) mystical, inseparably united to the preceding, is a crucifixion of the old man so that we may no longer live in bondage to Sin (Rom. VI,

1. Cf. Feine, *Theologie des neuen Testaments*[3], p. 263, Denney, *The Christian Doctrine of Reconciliation*, p. 227 ff.

2. In confirmation of the above doctrine we would quote a few lines from the pages of Père Garrigou-Lagrange, *Dieu son existence et sa nature*[4] p. 429-430 : " Qu'est-ce donc que la sainteté ? C'est une immuable pureté ; elle s'oppose à la souillure du péché et à l'imperfection ; immuable elle est le contraire de l'inconstance dans la pratique du bien... L'Amour de Dieu est absolument pur. — Non seulement Dieu est impeccable, mais nécessairement il déteste le péché d'une sainte haine, qui est la conséquence rigoureuse de l'Amour du Bien. Par sa profondeur et son intensité cet amour mérite le nom de zèle, comment pactiserait-il avec le mal, chercherait-il un compromis

6), to the Law (Gal. II, 19), to the world (Rom. VI, 4), to the world's doctrine and precepts (Col. II, 20), and to the affections of the mind that is set on earthly things (Col. III, 2, 3, 5).

But it is the punitive aspect of death that especially interests us here. The Apostle tells us that the Gentiles are supposed to know τὸ δικαίωμα τοῦ θεοῦ according to which those who do such things, i. e., the sins enumerated before, are ἄξιοι θάνατου ; basing his teaching on the belief of the pagans in the existence of a state of punishment in Hades, and seizing the kernel of truth he says, " who having known the justice of God did not understand that they who do such things are worthy of death (Rom. I, 32). Again Saint Paul explicitly tells us in Rom. V, 12-21 that death entered the world by Sin, that a great number die by the offence of one alone, that all die because all have sinned, and that death reigned in the world before the Law even over those who did not commit in the similitude of Adam a transgression directly punishable by death. The wages which Sin pays to its devotees is death (Rom. VI, 23). While we were in the state of fallen unregenerate human nature, the passions which were the causes of sins and which were fanned into life by the Law, were active in our members ; and the fruit of that union of the Law and the flesh was death (Rom. VII, 5). Death obtains its ascendancy over mankind, its power to slay, through Sin (1 Cor. XV, 56). As we all die because of Adam's transgression, so we shall rise from the dead by reason of our union with Christ (I Cor. XV, 21, 22 ; cf. also II Cor. II, 16 ; III, 6-9 ; VII, 10).

From the above texts it is clear that death is punitive, that it is a punishment of sin. But the question that now arises is, of what kind of death is the Apostle speaking ? Consistently with his theory Woods [1] maintains it is spiritual death ; the same view is held by Terry [2] and Workman [3]. Others as

avec lui ? A l'égard du mal obstiné, l'amour, qui est la douceur même, devient dur comme l'enfer... et l'enfer lui-même apparaît ainsi comme une manifestation de la pureté et de la sainteté de l'Amour de Dieu ". According to MOZLEY, *The Doctrine of the Atonement*, p. 69, " The wrath of God is an indispensable element in St. Paul's system ; apart from it religion would suffer ethically " ; GARVIE, *Studies of Paul and His Gospel*, pp. 134-138, finds Saint Paul's teaching on this point not only scientific but expressing a " truth of permanent and universal validity ".

1. *The Gospel of Rightness*, pp. 137, 138, 141.
2. *Biblical Dogmatics*, p. 121.
3. *At Onement or Reconciliation with God*, p. 95.

Garvie [1], Shears [2], and Denney [3], claim that it is physical death as invested with the horrors of a guilty conscience, and therefore ultimately eternal death. It seems however that the Apostle by the death in question designates primarily corporal, physical death. This sense is evidently required not only by I Cor. xv, 21, 22. 26, 56, but also by Romans v, 12-21 ; vi, 16, 21, 23 ; vii, 5 ; viii, 6, 10, 13. The series of texts in Rom. vii, 8 ff. might indeed, if taken separately, give the impression that they refer to spiritual death alone, but if attached to the preceding assertion, " the wages of sin is death " (vi, 23) they cause no difficulty to our explanation ; when the Apostle says, " I died " (vii, 10), he means that he became conscious of being submitted to death ; the personal guilty act ratified and reinforced the judgment of condemnation already burdening him by the fact of his appertaining to fallen humanity For it is by means of Sin that death gains ascendancy over mankind, Sin is the " sting of death " ; and to attain this end Sin uses the Law as its instrument ; it is for this reason also that the Law is called a law of sin and death (Rom. viii, 2) and a letter which killeth (II Cor. iii, 6-9).

In order to grasp fully the Apostle's conception of death we must note here that in his Epistles corporal death appears almost always in contrast with salvation and eternal life (Rom. v, 17, 18, 21 ; vi, 21, 22, 23 ; vii, 10 ; viii, 10-13 ; I Cor. xv, 21-22 ; II Cor. ii, 15, 16 ; iii, 6) ; similarly, the sentence of condemnation to death is correlative to the decree of justification giving a right to life (Rom. v, 18). From this contrast it is evident that for the Apostle physical death as compared with eternal life inaugurates a state of perpetual separation from God and exclusion from the Messianic kingdom [4]. Saint Paul does not go so far, as Rashdall [5] claims, as to regard the death of the sinner a complete annihilation ; but the survival of the sinner's soul in Sheol did not merit in the

1. O. c., p. 146 ff.
2. *The Gospel according to St. Paul*, p. 41 ff.
3. *The Christian Doctrine of Reconciliation*, p. 209 ff.
4. Cf. Toussaint, *L'épître aux Romains*, p. 169 ; Cornely, *Epistola ad Romanos*, p. 278.
5. *The Idea of Atonement*, p. 90 : " The wicked are punished, but they are punished by annihilation or in some way which ends in annihilation. The punishment of sin is literal death. St. Paul knows nothing of a natural or universal immortality ; the redeemed alone are immortal".

Apostle's mind the name of life. Thus the corporal death of the sinner is at the same time a state of eternal death (II Thess. I, 9).

While it is generally admitted that death is regarded by Saint Paul as caused by sin, Holtzmann [1] and others maintain that the Apostle assigns in fact a double cause for the origin of death : on the one hand it is conceived as a punishment positively inflicted by God's wrath on sin, and on the other hand it is considered as the natural punishment of sin, as the necessary consequence of man's carnal nature. In favor of the former are adduced such texts as Rom. V, 12, 15, 16, 18 ; VI, 23 ; I, 32, and in favor of the latter I Cor. XV, 56 ; Rom. VI, 16, 21 ; VIII, 6, 10. Are we then in the presence of two divergent currents of ideas ? In reply we would recall that we have seen above how in Rom. V, 12 — VIII, 23, the thought of Adam's transgression and of the consequences which Divine punishment attached to it does not disappear from the Apostle's mind. The flesh which Saint Paul considers as the principle of sin, is the flesh derived from Adam, and the death which he regards as a punishment of sin is the death which God inflicted on humanity in condemnation of the transgression of Adam. If the Apostle does not indicate each time the positive divine intervention this is due to the fact that once God established for all times the connection between sin and death in the case of Adam, these two powers are indissolubly bound together.

The question that now immediately suggests itself is, of what sin is death a punishment ? In Rom. I, 32 ; II, 8-12 ; III, 23 ; death seems to be a punishment of actual sins. So too

1. *Neutestamentliche Theologie*[2], p. 56 : after having discussed the two currents of Pauline thought, he concludes : " Die heraus sich ergebende, den ganzen Gedankenbau zersprengende, Antinomie ist genau die gleiche, wie die oben (S. 50) aus wiederstreitenden Aussagen über den Ursprung der Sünde sich ergebende und kann auch nicht einmal scheinbar und zur Not gelöst, sie kann nur als Offenbarung des Dualismus von pharisäischen und hellenistischen Faktoren begriffen und mit Analogien auf spätjudischer und zumal alexandrinischer Seite belegt werden ". For a discussion of this view cf. GOGUEL o. c. p. 157. Goguel however wrongly establishes a reconciliation between the two by maintaining that " la mort étant pour Paul la conséquence pour ainsi dire mécanique du péché, il puisse cependant la présenter comme venant de la colère de Dieu, puisque c'est à la suite de l'horreur que lui inspire l'idolâtrie de l'homme, que Dieu l'abandonne à la vie charnelle, c'est-à-dire au péché et à la mort qui en est la conséquence " (o. c. p. 160).

in Rom. v, 12 it is maintained by some that ἥμαρτον is to be explained according to Rom. III, 23, i. e., " to commits in ". Similarly in Rom. VII, 9-12, does not Saint Paul say that death gained control over him only when Sin produced the evil act in him? Hence it is said that according to Saint Paul every man dies because of his personal sins. And we have seen above in treating of originals in the two theories which attempt to explain according to this view the Pauline dictum that Adam is the cause of our death : on the one hand it is said that death as a sentence of condemnation was suspended over the race because of the transgression of Adam and that it attains all men only through their personal faults ; according to the other theory Adam can be called the cause of our death because he is the cause of our sins, i. e., because we inherited from him a flesh subject to concupiscence whereby we are instigated to actual sin. These two views however are not only unsatisfactory but wholly insufficient. For, as we have shown above, in Rom. v, 12-19, where it is said that death entered the world through sin, there is no question of the personal acts of individuals ; the primary idea which the Apostle wishes to bring out is that *One* is the Author of justice and life, just as *one* was the author of sin and death ; the sin therefore by which death is said in Rom. v, 12 to have entered the world is not actual sin but the power of Sin, i. e., original sin, introduced into humanity by the transgression of Adam. Again the above theories do not take into account the countless numbers of those who die before committing actual sins, before they could bring upon themselves the condemnation of death by any personal faults of their own. Furthermore, if man is not struck by the sentence of death except as a result of his personal sins, why, when he has obtained pardon in Christ and when the " spirit liveth because of justification ", is the body subject to death because of sin (Rom. VIII, 10) ? The sin therefore which is the cause of death is something anterior to positive transgressions and its consequences subsist even after our union with Christ. It is because all men really inherit from Adam ἡ ἁμαρτία, and because of the fact that being subject to this Sin implies a culpability, that all men are subject to death. In this explanation we can sufficiently account for such assertions as those of Rom. I, 32 ; III, 23 ; VII, 8 ; IX, 10 ; by saying that this sentence of death does not become the conscious and terrible

reality for men until at the moment when they transgress a positive law. The personal faults ratify and reinforce the judgment of condemnation already burdening the individual by the fact of his appertaining to the Adamic race.

II. THE PAULINE TEACHING ON DEATH AND MODERN SCIENCE.

Against such doctrine as outlined above, the evolutionary theory raises a violent protest. Death, it is categorically laid down, is a natural law to which all organisms are subject. Man therefore must share the fate of other living beings; he must grow, decay, and die. The view that Adam before his fall was endowed with the gift of immortality, they tell us, is absurd. And if one further raises the question as to what is man, the logic of the evolutionary theory not infrequently asserts itself in the denial of a separate spiritual nature in man to which immortality could attach [1]. Critics and Christian theologians as Ritschl [2], Terry [3], Garvie [4], Denney [5], Morgan [6], W. L. Walker [7], and Mackintosh [8], all unite their voices to proclaim that death is a natural necessity for animal organisms such as man's, and that before man was in the world death prevailed.

This theory, moreover, the above exponents hasten to assure us, is not without support in the Pauline Epistles. For does not the Apostle say in First Corinthians that " the first man Adam was made into a living soul ", that he was " natural... of the earth, earthly " (xv, 45, 46, 47) ? Now, does not a body which of itself is earthly, psychical, and corruptible, tend by its very constitution to dissolution and to death ? Does not death in these conditions indeed appear as the natural consequence of human nature ? In reply we would note that in the above passages Saint Paul does in fact indicate that the body of Adam was created natural, mortal, and subject

1. E. g. in the volume, *Darwin and Modern Science*, issued at Cambridge in connection with the Darwin commemoration.
2. O. c. vol. III[4], p. 341 ff.
3. O. c. p. 118.
4. O. c. p. 146 ff.
5. O. c. p. 210.
6. O. c. p. 19.
7. O. c. p. 288.
8. O. c. p. 291.

to corruption. But the Apostle does not say that Adam, though mortal in himself, did not possess before the fall the preternatural " gift of immortality, which was appointed him (Gen. III, 22), and which would have transfigured his earthly corporeity into the heavenly without its being destroyed in death"[1]. The Apostle conceives, on the one hand, as natural to man what on the other he regarded as neutralized and removed by privilege but reintroduced into humanity by the transgression of Adam. In I Cor. XV Saint Paul does not deny the fact that Adam before the fall possessed the gift of immortality, but wishing to oppose the first humanity to the second, he considers it such as it naturally is and was since the fall without paying attention to the state of primitive integrity through which it passed before Adam's transgression.

As to the claims of modern scientists that man would have suffered physical death as he now does, even if Adam had never sinned, it is to be noted that the only man scientists know is the mortal man descended from Adam ; to attempt to determine from his present state the condition of Adam before the fall is consequently illogical. And even if before the creation of man death in the case of the lower animals was a necessary and concomitant condition of life, it is not apparent how this is opposed or contrary to the doctrine of Saint Paul. For the Apostle is speaking of the death of *man*, and if man had not sinned death would have had no dominion over him.

But even in regard to the lower living organisms is death a necessary and universal law ? While it is customary to make this assumption, the question takes on a new aspect when a biologist of the rank of Weissman is found challenging it, and declaring that " the origin of death " is " one of the most difficult problems in the whole range of physiology " [2]. He says furthermore that there is no ascertainable reason why apart from what he considers the utility of it organisms should ever die. As a matter of fact he thinks an immense number of the lower organisms do not die, and has coined the phrase " immortality of the Protozoa ". Even as regards the higher organisms in which the conditions of longevity so surprisingly

1. B. Weiss, *Biblical Theology of the New Testament* (E. T.), vol. I, p. 336, cf. also Bovon, *Théologie du Nouveau Testament*[2], vol. II, p. 253.
2. *Essays upon Heredity* (E. T. Oxford, 1889), vol. I pp. 20, 25.

vary, he considers that " death is not a primary necessity, but that it has been secondarily acquired as an adaptation ". Hence it is not at all certain that death is an inherent law of organisms but may well depend on conditions which would not have affected sinless man.

Art. III. — THE EVER-EXPANDING EMPIRE OF SLAVERY TO SIN.

Having once succeeded in entering the world (Rom. v, 12), Sin not only brings all mankind under the sentence of damnation and death, but begins at once to establish and expand its despotic sway (Rom. v, 21). The corruption of the heart is followed by a darkening of the mind, and the corruption of the mind accelerates the perversion of morals ; depraved morals in turn increase the bondage of Sin over the sinner and become a source of scandal to others (cf. Rom. II, 24 ; XIV, 13, 20 ; I Cor. VIII, 9). It is thus that Saint Paul explains the progress of evil and idolatry in Rom. I, 18 ff.

The Divine Being perceived by nature and conscience imposed a triple duty upon the heathen : to search after Him once He is discerned, to honor Him, and to thank Him [1]. For among the pagans God did not leave Himself without a witness to His benevolence and Providence, but in the succession of the seasons and the bounties of nature taught them of Himself (Acts XIV, 16). The course of history also, especially the providential determining of " appointed times " and of the " limits of their habitation ", is a method of divine revelation by which God was seeking to lead the world to a knowledge of Himself (Acts XVII, 26). That, therefore, which the pagans were capable of knowing concerning God was manifested to them through the creation of the visible world which is so interpreted by the mind as to assure it of God's " eternal power and divinity " (Rom. I, 19). This revelation is sufficient to found responsibility and to make the Gentiles inexcusable for their disobedience, immorality, and idolatry.

So too the conscience of the heathen was a point of contact between God and man. In the course of an argument to show

1. Cf. Lattey, art. *De existentia Dei cognita*, VDni, 1923, pp. 311-314.

that the Jews, no less than the sinful heathen, can be justified by works of the Law, the Apostle incidentally dwells upon this manifestation of God which is made directly to the conscience of the pagan . " For when the Gentiles, who have not the law, do by nature those things that are of the law ; these having not the law are a law to themselves. Who show the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience bearing witness to them, and their thoughts between themselves accusing, or also defending one another " (Rom. II, 14, 15). The conscience of the heathen was consequently able to yield them such a knowledge of right and duty that it was possible that they should without further revelation conform to the essential contents of the Law. And even if their moral lives were extremely degraded, the accusations of conscience proved the existence of a sense of ill desert which itself presupposed a knowledge of the right. Conscience therefore performs the same function in the heathen world as does the Law in the Jewish ; it is equally competent to ground moral responsibility, to pronounce men inexcusable for their sins, and to show the way of salvation.

But the pagans in their impiety and unrighteousness repressed the promptings of truth as taught by nature and conscience, and as a result fell into ignorance, folly and idolatry. The Apostle, contrary to the opinion of Shears [1] who maintains a theory of the " total ignorance of sin on the part of the Gentiles " and consequently of a " non-imputation of guilt in their case on the part of God ", distinguishes in Rom. I, 21-23, five stages in the progress whereby the natural knowledge of God had been lost in heathendom ; 1) practical indifference to known truth ; the pagans did not act on their natural knowledge of God ; He was neither praised for His perfections as far as they were known, nor thanked for the blessings which were seen to be due to Him (οὐχ ὡς θεὸν ἐδόξασαν ἢ ηὐχαρίστησαν, V. 21) ; 2) worthless speculation about God : the ideas and reflections which the heathen formed for themselves respecting God became, without the proper safeguards, empty and fruitless

1. *The Gospel according to St. Paul*, p. 12 ff. According to RITSCHL, o. c. vol. III[4], pp. 357-358, sin is fundamentally and primarily an ignorance or indifference in regard to the Creator. With great psychological insight Ritschl shows that the continuous progress of sin in the bosom of humanity results not only from faults committed by each isolated individual but from the deleterious influence which such faults exercise on one another. But at the basis of individual sins he always places our native ignorance and our

(ἐματαιώθησαν ἐν τοῖς διαλογισμοῖς αὐτῶν, v. 21) ; 3) disappearance of the idea of God from the minds of men : their whole inner being (καρδία) became darkened because the empty speculations had rendered it ἀσύνετος, i. e., incapable of understanding what is true and right (καὶ ἐσκοτίσθη ἡ ασυνέτος αὐτῶν καρδία, v. 21) ; 4) a false conceit of wisdom coincident with abandonment to spiritual and moral folly (φάσκοντες εἶναι σοφοὶ ἐμωράνθησαν, v. 22) ; and finally 5) fetischism : the majesty of the imperishable God was exchanged for something shaped like the image of perishable man or of the lower creatures (καὶ ἤλλαξαν τὴν δόξαν τοῦ αφθάρτου θεοῦ ἐν ὁμοιώματι εἰκόνος φθαρτοῦ ἀνθρώπου καὶ πετεινῶν καὶ τετραπόδων καὶ ἑρπετῶν, v. 23) (cf. Eph IV, 17-20).

For the neglect and abuse of the natural knowledge of God the heathens were punished by being abandoned to the moral consequences of their unfaithfulness. In this punishment Saint Paul marks three stages (Rom. I, 24-28) : 1) impurity of life leading to mutual corporal degradation (v. 24) ; the reason for this terrible punishment was due to the fact that the heathen exchanged the Divine Reality for false gods and that they paid worship to the creature instead of the Creator (v. 25) ; 2) sensual degradation assuming in both sexes unnatural forms (v. 26); and 3) an active mental disposition towards intellectual and moral truth which is to be pronounced reprobate (παρέδωκεν εἰς ἀδόκιμον νοῦν, v. 28). The measure of the νοῦς ἀδόκιμος corresponds to their contemptuous rejection of the natural knowledge of God which ought to have been brought to a loving knowledge of Him. In practice it leads to the doing of what is not seemly, τὰ μὴ καθήκοντα. In Rom. I, 29-31 we have twenty one illustrations of the general ποιεῖν τὰ μὴ καθήκοντα which pratically result from the νοῦς ἀδόκιμος : the heathen of Saint Paul's time are described as having been filled with four governing forms of evil, ἀδικία, πονηρία, πλεονεξία, and κακία, as full of bitter anti-social sins, as sinners by self-assertion or pride, and as sinners of six kinds against natural principles on which society is based [1].

natural tendency to claim an unlimited liberty in conduct (Anspruch auf eine unbeschränkte Freiheit). This theory, needless to say, lacks a Scriptural basis ; besides, for Saint Paul the culpable ignorance of the heathen was not the first cause of sin, but rather its punishment and effect. Cf. BERTRAND, *Une nouvelle conception de la Rédemption*, p. 233.

1. It is to be remarked that while in Rom. c. 2 the bondage to sin is considered as a punishment ordained by God, in c. 6 this connexion of sins is

And when the Apostle's thought widens to take in the whole race it is the same charge of guilt for evil choices and inexcusable deeds which he makes against the Jews (Rom. II, 1). He accuses them, first of all, of the practice (πράσσειν) of such things as have already been charged against the Gentiles : there is contempt for God's goodness, hardness and impenitence of heart for which God will punish them according to their deeds (Rom. II, 2-6). And the catalogue of the Jews' sins is further swelled by the mention of such crimes as theft, robbery, adultery, robbery of temples, and blasphemy (Rom. II, 21-24), sins of choice and purpose for which they cannot escape the punishment of God, for the law of divine judgment is : " to every man according to his deeds " (Rom. II, 6 ; II Cor. V, 10).

The Mosaic Law which God gave to the Jew was indeed to be for the latter the strong arm of combat against the יֵצֶר הָרַע, the instrument of justice, and the way of salvation. But while the Law was holy and spiritual, man was carnal, sold under sin (Rom. VII, 14). Hence even the fervent Israelite and the faithful observer of the Law found no rest or repose in this economy of salvation. For the yoke of the Law was difficult to carry, and the judgments of God rigorous and exacting. Crushed by these sentiments of helplessness and the consciousness of sin, many of the pious Jews minimized the requirements of the Law by maintaining that God does not require their absolute and integral fulfilment. They proclaimed the necessity of penance and conversion, and appealed to grace and the merciful promises of God. To these conceptions were allied the ideas of the imputation of the transcendent and superabundant merits of ancestors, the expiatory value of sufferings and sacrifices of the ancient alliance, and the efficacy

---

presented as natural, as resulting spontaneously from the constitution of man and the nature of sin (cf. vv. 19-21). Are we then in the presence of two viewpoints which exclude one another ? We do not think so, for on the one hand sin could very well be regarded as natural, while on the other hand Saint Paul could justly consider this bondage to sin as a punishment of God who after the first offence withdraws His grace from man and abandons him to the evil desires of his heart. For God as Creator had established a nexus between moral acts, involving the consequence of one crime upon another — parallel to the consequence of one virtue upon another : " For to everyone that hath shall be given, and he shall abound, but from him that hath not, that also which he seemeth to have shall be taken away " (Mtt. XXV, 29 ; cf. Rom. I, 28).

of supererogatory works. They thus hoped to cover the inevitable transgressions of the Law and the innumerable daily sins [1].

Hence when the Apostle looks out upon the whole of mankind he comes to the mournful conclusion : " all have sinned and do need the glory of God " (Rom. III, 23). And the Apostle's own poignant cry, " Unhappy man that I am, who shall deliver me from the body of this death " (Rom. VII, 24) is only a typical example of that universal need and desire of Redemption. It is the *de profundis* of sinful and degraded humanity oppressed and enslaved by the binding chains of sin. But good will arise from the excess of evil, and if " Scripture hath concluded all under sin " it was in order that " the promise by the faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe " (Gal. III, 22). In the " fulness of time ", when man's own helplessness should have been thoroughly manifested, God will execute His merciful purposes and designs, for His will is that " all men be saved and come to the knowledge of the truth " (I Tim. II, 4).

1. Cf. LAGRANGE, *Épître aux Romains*, pp. 183-188.

PART II

The Redemption.

PRELIMINARY.

In the plenitude of time when the providential preparations were accomplished God sent into the world His only begotten Son that men might be redeemed from the tyranny of sin and receive adoptive filiation (Gal. IV, 4, 5). The work of man's restoration is according to the Apostle grounded in the eternal designs of God's love. In the death of Christ for sinful men God is commending or confirming His love towards them : " God commendeth his charity towards us, because when as yet we were sinners Christ died for us " (Rom. V, 8). His gift of Christ is so great a proof of His love that the Apostle concludes, arguing from the greater to the less, that He will not withhold anything from those whom He has chosen in Him (Rom. VIII, 32 ; Eph. I, 4). It is because God is " rich in mercy" and " on account of his exceeding charity wherewith he loved men " that He quickened us into new life and raised us up into fellowship with the Exalted Christ (Eph. II, 4, 5). This redeeming work is " according to the eternal purpose which He made in Christ Jesus, our Lord " (Eph. III, 11), in Whom believers were chosen before the foundation of the world (Eph. I, 4).

The redemptive mission and its multiple aim is clearly described by the Apostle in two well-known passages : " When the fulness of the time was come, God sent His Son, made of a woman, made under the law, that he might redeem them who were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons " (Gal. IV, 4, 5 : ὅτε δὲ ἦλθεν τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ χρόνου, ἐξαπέστειλεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ, γενόμενον ἐκ γυναικός, γενόμενον ὑπὸ νόμον,

ἵνα τοὺς ὑπὸ νόμον ἐξαγοράσῃ, ἵνα τὴν υἱοθεσίαν ἀπολάβωμεν [1]) ; " What the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son, in the likeness of sinful flesh and of sin, hath condemned sin in the flesh " (Rom. VIII, 3 : τὸ γὰρ ἀδύνατον τοῦ νόμου, ἐν ᾧ ἠσθένει διὰ τῆς σαρκός, ὁ θεὸς τὸν ἑαυτοῦ υἱὸν πέμψας ἐν ὁμοιώματι σαρκὸς ἁμαρτίας καὶ περὶ ἁμαρτίας κατέκρινεν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν ἐν τῇ σαρκί).

God accordingly sent His own Son, pre-existent from al eternity, to remedy the powerlessness attributed to and recognized in the Mosaic Law. The Law showed to man the way of justice and was to lead him to life. But it became paralysed when it found itself in the presence of the flesh, it was rendered helpless when it encountered the Sin which had lodged itself in the flesh. It was in fact the active instrument of Sin which in turn was the power whereby death gained ascendancy over humanity. Hence the Law is justly characterized by the Apostle as a " law of sin and of death " (Rom. VIII, 2). To vanquish and annul sin God therefore sent His Son into the world and that " in the likeness of sinful flesh ".

But what does the Apostle really mean when he says that Christ was sent ἐν ὁμοιώματι σαρκὸς ἁμαρτίας ? According to Shears [2], J. Weiss [3], Du Bose [4], and Morgan [5], the flesh of Christ was a sinful flesh like that of other men. Holtzmann [6] claims that the Pauline theology demands this interpretation. These authors usually distinguish between the sinful flesh of Christ and His sinless personality [7], i. e., they maintain that the latent

1. Cf. HAEUSER, art. *Der Gottessohn " geworden unter dem Gesetze "*, BZ, 1913, pp. 178-184.

2. *The Gospel according to St. Paul*, p. 79, says : " It was this actual ' flesh of sin ', *our* flesh, fraught with the *disease* of sin, with the *tendency* to actual sin, that Our Lord took, thus rendering Himself liable to be ' tempted in all points like as we are ' ".

3. *Die Schriften des neuen Testaments*[2], vol. II, p. 274, similarly says : " getan hat er nie eine Sünde (II Cor. V, 21) aber das ändert nichts daran dasz sein Fleisch wie das unsre ein unter die Sünde verkauftes (VII, 14) war, im Dienst der Sünde unablässig bemüht, ihn zum Bösen zu verfuhren ". FEINE, *Theologie des neuen Testaments*[3], p. 225, rejects this view as an " unpaulinischer Gedanke ". Cf. also B. WEISS, *Biblical Theology of the New Testament* (E. T), vol. I, pp. 406-407, GARVIE, *Studies of Paul and this Gospel*, p. 125.

4. *The Gospel according to St. Paul*, p. 219 ff.

5. *The Religion and Theology of Paul*, p. 67.

6. *Lehrbuch der neutestamentlichen Theologie*, p. 77 ff.

7. In modern times, however, the sinlessness of Christ is coming to be more and more challenged or surrendered by the exponents of the " New Theology ".

potentialities of Christ's flesh never developed or emerged into sinful acts. In criticism of this opinion it is to be noted that the Apostle does not say that Christ came " in a flesh of sin " whence it could truly be inferred that Christ took on a sinful flesh ; nor, again, does Saint Paul say " in the likeness of flesh " whence we might conclude that Christ did not have a real flesh or that His flesh was of a nature different from ours. But with a rare happiness of expression the Apostle says ἐν ὁμοιώματι of sinful flesh. Now ὁμοιώμα denotes likeness not sameness, resemblance and not identity. Thus the pagans are said to have changed the glory of God into a likeness (ἐν ὁμοιώματι) expressed in an image of corruptible man, i. e., they made and worshipped images which were so shaped as to resemble perishable man (Rom. I, 23). Elsewhere (Rom. V, 14) the Apostle speaks of sinning " after the likeness " (ἐπὶ τῷ ὁμοιώματι) of Adam's transgression, that is, in a similar manner, against an explicit positive command. Now things which are alike in some respects may also be different in others equally important. And if a writer clearly affirms that two things are alike for the very purpose of avoiding the inference that they are identically the same, then so far the difference is as essential and emphatic as the resemblance. Such is the case in this instance. The Son of God took on a σάρξ which had all the essential endowments of human nature but which was free from original sin, since He was born not by natural generation but by the supernatural operation of the Spirit ; it was in this sense that the Fathers interpreted the passage against certain heretics who on the ground of these words denied that Christ had a true human nature and flesh.

It is furthermore stated in Rom. VIII, 3, that God in sending His Son περὶ ἁμαρτίας, κατέκρινεν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν ἐν τῇ σαρκί. How are we to understand κατέκρινεν, how did God " condemn " sin in the flesh ? Those authors who, as we indicated above, maintain the sinfulness of Christ's flesh, explain κατέκρινεν

Thus CAMPBELL, art. *Jesus or Christ,* HJ (Suppl.), 1909, p. 191, says : " To speak of Him as morally perfect is absurd ; to call Him sinless is worse, for it introduces an entirely false emphasis into the relations of God and man ". The Gospel tells us that Our Lord demanded of those who knew Him, " which of you shall convince me of sin " (John VIII, 46), and that no one could answer Him. But after nineteen centuries, behold ! modern critics have become bolder, and claim that they know better. Cf. FELDER, *Jesus Christus*[2], p. 185 ff.

in the following manner : Christ maintained a perpetual conflict against sin and achieved an unbroken victory over it ; He saved human nature in His own person in spite of all that it was as the nature of Adam and thereby reconciled humanity to God ; the condemnation of sin lies in His conquest of it as man ; it is a *Christus salvus factus* who becomes a *Christus salvos faciens ;* He saved Himself by resisting sin unto blood, and He saves us by His example to walk in His steps ; His sinlessness is a proof that for mankind, whose nature He made His own, sin is unnecessary and unjustified[1]. But the text and context of Rom. VIII, 3, authorize no such interpretation of κατέκρινεν. The pivotal idea of the Apostle in this passage is the word " flesh ", and his thought converges to this central point : give to man what the Law, rendered powerless by sinful flesh, was unable to give. The Son of God took a flesh in all respects like to ours save original sin. And God in sending His Son in this apparently sinful flesh condemns sin in the flesh : the Incarnation itself because it was destined to vanquish sin is already a proof that God has condemned sin. To arrive actually and *de facto* at this result another thing will be necessary, namely, the redeeming death of the Son undergone voluntarily and in loving obedience for us ; in the present passage the Apostle neither includes nor excludes it. In the flesh of Christ immolated for us all on the Cross God, finally, condemned and cast out sin[2]. Before passing on to study in detail the entire accomplishment of this redeeming work let us study more fully the Person of the Divine Envoy.

---

1. Cf. MORGAN, o. c., p. 67, DU BOSE, o. c., p. 219 ff., J. WEISS, o. c., p. 274, WESTCOTT, *St. Paul and Justification*, p. 293.

The above view gave rise to a theory of the Atonement known as " Redemption by Sample ", a phrase said to have been coined by A. B. Bruce, and which indicates the view that " Christ redeemed not us but His own humanity by the power of the Spirit gaining a victory over the flesh, which was sinful in Him as in us, and by dying on the cross not for our sin, but in condemnation of the sinfulness of His own human nature ". (Words of A. B. Bruce, *Theological Review and Free Church Quarterly*, vol. II, p. 261, quoted in MACKINTOSH, *Historic Theories of Atonement*, p. 232).

2. Cf. LAGRANGE, *Épître aux Romains*, p. 194, CORNELY, *Epistola ad Romanos*, p. 249, CALLAN, *The Epistles of St. Paul*, vol. I, pp. 122-123, PRAT, o. c., vol. II[6], pp. 194-197.

Speaking of this theory, DENNEY, *The Christian Doctrine of Reconciliation*, p. 249, says that it " might be inspiring, or it might be, as just explained, the quenching of the sinner's last hope ". Cf. also MACKINTOSH, o. c., pp. 248-250. SANDAY, o. c., p. 193, explains κατέκρινεν with reference to Rom. VI,

CHAPTER I.

The Person of the Redeemer.

To give a detailed account of the Pauline Christology, on the one hand, and of modern views concerning the Person of Christ, on the other, would require a separate treatise. We shall therefore limit ourselves to certain general considerations in so far as they bear on our present subject ; for a false conception of the Redeemer leads to a correspondingly wrong or insufficient view of the Redemption ; it is because Modern Protestantism conceives Christ as a mere prophet, who excelled others solely by His moral grandeur, that it has reduced the whole redeeming work to its ethical appeal and psychological influence on our lives.

Art. I. — CHRISTOLOGY AND MODERN CRITICISM.

Among the various movements at work in modern thought the application of historical criticism to the literature of the New Testament stands out foremost. Feverish attempts are being made to bring out information concerning what is known as the Jewish and Gentile background of the Pauline Epistles ; the former, it is said, gave rise to the Exalted Christ of Saint Paul, the latter to the Mystic Christ. This movement emanates from a belief that the Christ of theological speculation has replaced the Jesus of history and of religion. In this " recovery " of the historic Jesus and in this " reducing " of the theological Christ, the miraculous and metaphysical, needless to say, is carefully set aside. The method of these critics was strikingly illustrated in the Supplement of the Hibbert Journal,

---

6-11 : " By the death of Christ upon the Cross, a death endured in His human nature, He once and forever broke off all contact with Sin, which could only touch Him through that nature. Henceforth Sin can lay no claim against Him. Neither can it lay any claim against the believer ; for the believer also has died with Christ ". This theory however is insufficient, it does not show how *God* condemns sin ; again if sin can lay no claim against Christ (II Cor. v, 21), how can His Death free Him from it ?

1909, when seventeen writers, not very representative, were invited to write on the alternative, " Jesus or Christ " [1]. The purpose of most of these essays was " to discover as far as may be the real Jesus of history, that, relieved of of the drapery of mythology and set free from all dogmatic fictions..... our perceptions of the historical Jesus may be clearer than those of the men who were obliged to interpret him through the mists of the Jewish and pagan religions " [2].

The answers of Protestantism to the question, " Jesus or Christ ", may be conveniently divided into two categories, that of the Liberals and that of the Rationalists. The former is represented in France by Sabatier [3], and in Germany by Ritschl [4], Harnack [5], Jülicher [6], Bousset [7], Weinel [8], and others; on the German school of Liberalism depend in turn similar movements of thought in England [9] and in America [10]. According to Sabatier, Christ neither was nor wished to be anything more than a master, an initiator and promoter in the religious order. His affirmations and claims were mere enthusiastic effusions, destined to render His teaching more penetrating and His example more effective. Seeing God in the filial mirror of His beautiful soul, conscious of knowing and loving God better than others, indignant at the intolerable burdens which the Pharisees in the name of the Law imposed upon men, feeling in Himself a power and energy which could transform the face of the earth, elevated by the flights of His soul to the highest point that a son of man could reach, considering life as a gift of which, in spite of the hardships which it imposed, all who would follow in His footsteps could joyfully participate,

---

1. In the editorial preface of this volume it is stated : " What is here under discussion is the *whole problem* of the relation of the Jesus of History to the Christ of Religion ".

2. Words of C. LESTER, *The Historic Christ, a Study of the Synoptic Gospels* (New York, 1912), pp. VII-IX of the preface.

3. Cf. *Esquisse d'une philosophie de la religion d'après la psychologie et l'histoire* (Paris, 1896); *Les religions d'autorité et la religion de l'esprit* (Paris, 1903).

4. *Rechtfertigung und Versöhnung*[4], vol. III, p. 425 ff.

5. *Das Wesen des Christentums, passim.*

6. *Die Religion Jesu* (in Hinneburg's collection, *Die Kultur der Gegenwart*, I, 4, Leipzig, 1906).

7. *Jesus* (in coll. *Religionsgeschichtliche Volksbücher*, ed. Schiele, Tübingen, 1904).

8. *Jesus* (in coll. *Die Klassiker der Religion*, Berlin, 1912).

9. Cf. e. g. RASHDALL, *The Idea of Atonement*, p. 435 ff : HJ (Suppl.), 1909.

10. Cf. e. g. WORKMAN, *At Onement or Reconciliation with God, passim.*

Jesus of Nazareth could easily assume the attitude and arrogate to Himself the honors which the Evangelists attribute to Him. In reality, however, He was nothing more than a great leader of men, a commanding genius, an inspiring prophet[1]. According to Harnack, in the character and life of Jesus God made a supreme, culminating, and unique revelation of Himself. No one knew the Father as well as the Son, and by communicating this knowledge to men Christ rendered an incomparable service to " many ". He brought men closer to God not only by what He said, but also by what He was, by what He did, and by what He suffered. He knew that by His preaching He was opening a new era, that He is the road which leads to God, and that as God's Elect He is also a universal mediator and supreme judge of humanity. But however magnificent and unique be His prerogatives, the Person of Jesus, we are told, does not form an integral part of the Gospel which He preached. At this point we see the influence of the old defiance against the intelligence as applied to things of faith, an attitude, which the German theologians inherited *à travers* Kant's critique from Luther. In its place are substituted certain subjective and utilitarian judgments, called " judgments of value " *(Werturteile)*. It matters little, we are told, who Jesus really was, if He has for me a true religious value. To be saved it is sufficient to believe not what the Son is but what He says.

The Rationalistic school, unlike the former, does not admit the unique perfection and moral grandeur of the Saviour, but maintains that He was subject to all the weaknesses, errors, and illusions of humanity, and to all the limitations of His time and race[2]. But how on this supposition explain the Scriptures

1. According to Bacon, *Jesus and Paul* (New York, 1921), Christ first appears as a prophet of reconciliation and later of expiation. Piepenbring, *Jesu historique* (Strasburg, 1921), sees in Christ a pure eschatologist. Others as Peabody, *Jesus Christ and the Social Question* (New York, 1915), see in Him, when He is properly " reduced ", only a humanitarian Jesus whose ethic contained the principles of social reform.

2. Some rationalists reduce our knowledge of Christ to the narrowest limits, or deny that the portrait presented is sufficient to justify the claim that Christ is perfect man ; cf. Schmiedel, art. *The Christ of Theology and the Jesus of History*, HJ (Suppl.), 1909, p. 68, Campbell, art. *Jesus or Christ*, HJ (Suppl.), 1909, p. 191, Gardner, *Religious Experience of St. Paul*, pp. 242-243. Some still bolder deny that Christ ever lived ; ita J. M. Robertson, *The Jesus Problem : a Restatement of the Myth Theory* (London, 1917), Drews, *The Witnesses to the Historicity of Jesus* (E. T., London, 1912) ; for a consideration of this view cf. Conybeare, *The Historical Christ, or an Investigation*

and the fact of Christianity? Is then the traditional interpretation founded on a misunderstanding ? Is the solution which the early Christian generation gave to the problem of Christ, which has been attested by millions of human beings, and which was sealed by the blood of countless martyrs and saints, an illusion? Above all, how explain the *idée-génératrice*, the testimony of Christ concerning Himself ? To extricate himself from these embarrassing difficulties the Rationalist usually follows one of two courses. In the first case, accepting the historicity of the Gospel narrative, he proceeds with all the insidious subtlety of which he is capable to reconstitute the different states of soul which gradually led the Saviour to say and believe that He was the Messias and Son of God. He appeals to Christ's sentiments of union with His heavenly Father, the influence of the ancient prophecies on His soul, the enthusiasm of His followers, the need of answering the violent attacks of His adversaries, facts, which led the Saviour gradually to accept and finally to claim a title which at first He would have repudiated as blasphemous. Besides, if many a religious leader is often deified by his disciples and followers, why should not the same principle be applied to the case of the Master of Nazareth ? Or, following another direction, the Rationalist directs all his attacks against the historicity of the Scripture narrative, and proceeds unduly to simplify the Gospel text and the historic data of early Christianity. He finds almost an infinite number of redactional details, later additions, and pagan infiltrations, in the Gospels. The study of documents or " substrata " which " underly " as it were our present text allows him to multiply indefinitely doubtful passages and interpolations. And whatever remains, after this simplification and mutilation has been executed, is explained by hypotheses and conjectures which are most incompatible with the moral grandeur and perfection of Christ [1].

I. But if the above be true portraits of Christ, how explain Saint Paul's Christology, the insurmountable barrier to the

---

of the Views of Mr. J. M. Robertson, Dr. A. Drews, and Prof. W. B. Smith (London, 1914), in which the author criticizes the " untrained explorers ", and makes " a plea for moderation and good sense in dealing with the writings of early Christianity " (pref., p. 1) ; cf. also THORBURNE, *Jesus the Christ; Historical or Mythical ? a Reply to Prof. Drews* (Edinburgh, 1912).

1. Cf. LOISY, *Jesus et la tradition évangelique* (Paris, 1910), *passim*.

Liberal and the Rationalist ? At this point Protestants, in order to extricate themselves from an embarrassing position, make a distinction which would surely cause no small shock to Saint Paul should he by chance drop into some of our modern *Kerr* or *Bampton Lectures;* they make a distinction between what they call the " religion " and " theology " of Paul ; the former the Apostle is said to have drawn from the pure fountains of the Master, the latter is due to his Pharisaical and Hellenistic training, and is wholly unacceptable to the " modern " (!) mind. Thus according to Morgan [1] and others, the Apostle introduced the Christ-worship, His divinity, and the title κύριος, from Hellenism. To enter into a detailed examination of this latter view and to institute a comparison between Saint Paul and the mystery-religions is beyond the scope of this study ; besides, this work has been carefully done by others [2]. For our present purpose we think it more important to show that the supposition on which the above and similar claims are based, namely, that Saint Paul received an education in Greek philosophy and literature, is entirely without foundation in the Pauline Epistles and in the New Testament, and that consequently Paul before his conversion was not a liberal but a rigid Jew. Secondly, we shall point out that if Saint Paul, like his Jewish contemporaries, believed, in spite of his pure Judaism and serious monotheism, in the divinity of Christ, this belief could have its foundation only in the divine Christ Himself and in revelation. And lest it be objected that Saint Paul was influenced by Hellenism after his conversion and especially during his sojourn in Tarsus, we shall demonstrate, in the third place, that as to his gospel, the principal point of which was *Jesus Christ considered as the Divine Redeemer,* Saint Paul was always in fundamental agreement with the

1. *The Religion and Theology of Paul,* pp. 46, 50.

2. Cf. JACQUIER, art. *(Les) Mystères païens et saint Paul,* DApFC, vol. III, col. 964-1014, MANGENOT, *La doctrine de saint Paul et les mystères païens,* RCF, 1913, vol. LXXIV, pp. 1-32, 257-289, art. *La langue de saint Paul et celle des mystères païens,* RCF, 1913, vol. LXXV, pp. 129-161, art. *Saint Paul et les mystères païens,* RPAp, 1918, pp. 176, 241, 339, PRAT, art. *Paul et le paulinisme,* DApFC, fasc. XVIII, col. 1621-1654, KENNEDY, *Saint Paul and the Mystery Religions,* London, 1913, MACHEN, *The Origin of Paul's Religion,* New York, 1921, ALLO, *L'Évangile en face du syncrétisme païen,* Paris, 1910. Cf. also our art. *St. Paul and Hellenism: a Study,* ACQR, 1920, pp. 255-273.

original apostles. Finally we shall say a few words concerning the so-called " Pharisaical preconceptions " of the Apostle.

A. While it has heretofore been customary to regard the Jewish side of Saint Paul's nature as the foundation on which his character was built, several modern scholars and writers have recently challenged this assumption. It is to Hellenism, we are told, that Saint Paul is chiefly indebted. In the first place it is maintained that Saint Paul was educated at the Tarsian universities, which ranked next after Athens and Alexandria [1], and that his Epistles show that he had studied Stoicism, was at least acquainted with its leading doctrines, and had read some of its authors [2]. " The Pauline thought ", says Sir W. Ramsay [3], " is wholly inconceivable in a mere narrow Hebrew and wholly inexplicable without an education in Greek philosophy ". In consequence of this environment Saint Paul is further represented as a liberal son of the Dispersion. " The Tarsian influences ", says the same author [4], " marked out Paul already before his birth, as the man who was destined to be the Apostle to the Gentiles ", and elsewhere he again says, " The crowning glory of Tarsus, the reason for its undying interest to the whole world is that it was the one city which was suited by its equipoise between the Asiatic and Western spirit to mould the character of the great Hellenist Jew " [5]. So too A. Menzies and W. Edie [6] from the very outset set before us Saint Paul the Hellenist almost to the entire exclusion of Saint Paul the Jew. We are told how he would regard the Gentiles with a liberal eye, how he would hear Cynic and Stoic doctrines at the street-corners and so pick up tricks of rhetoric, how he would take note of the religious rites of heathenism and learn something of the principal deities at Tarsus. And the authors sum up their conclusions as follows : " of a Jewish training at Jerusalem it is harder to find traces in his work ", " of rabbinic method there is little trace in Paul " [7]. The critics, taking for granted the points just

1. Cf. Ramsay, *The Teaching of Paul in Terms of the Present Day*, pp. 40-49.
2. Cf. Rackham, *Acts of the Apostles* (London, 1912), p. 306.
3. *The Cities of St. Paul*, p. 34.
4. *The Teaching of Paul in Terms of the Present Day*, p. 31.
5. *The Cities of St. Paul*, p. 235.
6. Art. *St. Paul*, ERE, vol. IX, pp- 680-695.
7. Ibid., p. 681.

mentioned, proceed thereupon to point out how there is scarcely a single important passage in Saint Paul's Epistles which is not actually derived from or at least paralleled in Stoicism, Platonism, or the mystery religions.

The *point d'appui* of those who maintain the advanced classic culture of Saint Paul at Tarsus are three quotations which are incessantly adduced. The first is the hexameter from the poem on *Oracles*, written, according to St. Jerome, by the Cretan poet Epimenides in stern and contemptuous depreciation of his country-men : " The Cretans are always liars, evil beasts, slothful bellies " (Tit. I, 12 : Κρῆτες ἀεὶ ψεῦσται, κακὰ θηρία, γαστέρες ἀργαί). It was quoted by Collimachus in the *Hymn of Zeus*, and was well known in antiquity. For the Cretans were among the three very bad K's of olden times. They were called liars because they claimed that the tomb of Zeus was on their island ; the original Greek word, moreover, meant to " tell lies ". Of their gluttony, drunkenness, and sensuality, and above all their greed, ample testimonies are quoted[1]. This stinging line Saint Paul applies to the Cretansin general as well as to those disorderly, prating, and self deceiving Jewish Christians who for the sake of filthy lucre turn whole families upside down. It is just such a national characterization as might pass from mouth to mouth and thus become a tag of a market place. The second is a half-hexameter in which Saint Paul reminds his audience in the speech on the Areopagus that certain of their native poets had said : " For we are also his offspring " (Acts XVII, 28 : τοῦ γὰρ καὶ γένος ἐσμέν). This is a recognized commonplace of heathen insight to which many parallels could be quoted; Saint Paul might have well heard it in a chance conversation without being once obliged to unroll a classical papyrus. The quotation is taken from the *Phaenomena* of Aratus, who was a Cilician and most probably a Tarsian, and is also found in Cleanthes' *Hymn to Jove*. The third is a moral warning to the Corinthians to awaken to righteousness out off their drunken dream of disbelief, and break off the sinful habits which it engendered: " Evil communications corrupt good manners " (I Cor. XV, 33 : φθείρουσιν ἤθη χρηστὰ ὁμιλίαι κακαί). This is one of those common sententious pieces of morality, a proverbial gnome, which in all probability Meander

1. Cf. Liv. XLIV, 45.

in his *Thais* had appropriated from some lost tragedy of Euripedes. But Saint Paul most likely heard it in common parlance or saw it inscribed on one of the Hermae at Tarsus and Athens.

Several points in connection with the above quotations deserve further attention. A remarkable thing is that all three of the quotations are found in at least two poets each, and, secondly, that two of them occur at the very beginning of the *Hymn of Zeus*. It is likewise noteworthy that in the quotation from Meander, or Euripedes, the great majority of the MSS give a reading which may certainly be regarded as genuine, since no one would alter the correct metre if it had been given in the original manuscript. Hence Saint Paul was indifferent to or unfamiliar with so common a rhythm as the iambic verse [1].

Although the notion, therefore, that Saint Paul was a classical scholar has little foundation, can it still be maintained that because of the spirit and surroundings amid which he was reared, he was a liberal Jew of the Diaspora, a Hellenist in the true sense ? The Jews, as a nation, have always shown an almost miraculous vitality, and far from being denationalized by a home among the heathen, have only been confirmed in the intensity of their patriotism and of their faith. One of the chief means of preserving the faith of their fathers was the

---

1. This is the more surprising in view of the fact that Saint Paul was a man of remarkable receptivity. His retentive memory is traceable in the extent to which he is constantly haunted by a word, and in the new and often rare expressions which are found in every one of his Epistles, and which show a mind keenly susceptible to impressions derived from the circumstances around him and from those with whom he came into contact. He is, furthermore, a habitual quoter, often weaving into one brief quotation the verbal reminiscences of several passages (cf. Rom. I, 24, IV, 17, IX, 33, X, 18 ; I Cor. VI). Except in Epistles intended mainly for Gentile Christians, to whom OT quotations would have been unintelligible, he can hardly write five sentences without a Biblical reference. The utter absence of any similar use of even the noblest of the classic writers is a proof that he intentionally neglected them, or what is more probable, was wholly unacquainted with them. For who that has read Saint Paul can believe that he had ever studied Homer or Aeschylus or Sophocles ? Would there in a writer who often " thinks in quotations " be no allusion to epic or tragic poetry in Epistles written at Athens and at Corinth? Had Saint Paul been a reader of Aristotle, would he have argued in the style which he adopts in the Epistles to the Galatians and to the Romans ? Had he been a reader of Plato would the fifteenth chapter of the first Epistle to the Corinthians have carried in it not the faintest allusions to the guesses of Phaedo ? Cf. PRAT, o. c., vol. I[9], p. 486 ff.

regular meeting for worship in the synagogues on the Sabbath ; Saint Paul in the course of his travels through Asia Minor and Greece everywhere met with Jewish synagogues, as for example, in Antioch of Pisidia, Iconium, Ephesus, Thessalonica, Berea, Athens, and Corinth (cf. e. g. Acts IX, 20, XIII, 5, 14, XIV, 1, XVIII, 19). The exclusiveness of their prejudices, the peculiarity of their institutions, the jealousy of their successes, could not but create hatred, suspicion, and contempt in many countries. There seems to be no limit to the curiosity, disgust, and contempt with which the Jews were regarded in ancient times[1]. Reference to them in the literature of classical antiquity is full of absurd calumnies and biting sarcasm. Men did not hesitate to circulate against them the most ridiculous and abominable stories, stories which had been invented especially by the *literati* of Alexandria[2]. The exodus, above all, had in the course of time been worked up into a complete romance, picturing Moses as a leader of a band of lepers who were expelled by an Egyptian king and sent into the stone quarries or into the wilderness. Cicero heaps scorn and indignation upon them

1. It is true that some of the more educated Jews were not content with an infructose Rabbinism, and often tried to harmonize the Jewish and Hellenistic idiosyncrasies and to represent the facts of their history and the institutions of their religion in such a light as would least awaken the contempt of the nations among whom they lived. Such was e. g. the main object of Josephus in his *Antiquities*, and traces of a similar tendency are to be found in the *Stromata* of Clement of Alexandria and in the *Praeparatio Evangelica* (VII, 14, VIII, 10, XII, 12 ; M. III) of Eusebius. The latter devotes several books to the exposition of the excellence of the Hebrew system, and demonstrates the proposition that Moses and the prophets lived before the greatest Greek writers, and that these drew their knowledge from the former. Similarly Clement tells us (*Stromata*, I, 24, II, 18, VI, 3 ; ed. *Wilson*, vol. I, p. 456, vol. II, pp. 47-57, 319 ff) that the " virtues delineated in Moses supplied the Greeks with the rudiments of the whole department of morals ", that the Greeks plagiarized the miracles in the Scriptures and related them as prodigies of Hellenic mythology, that Miltiades imitated the generalship of Moses, etc. But in this attempt to prove that all Greek wisdom was derived from Jewish sources, there was a tendency among the advanced Hellenists to adopt unauthorized additions to their history and to that style of exegesis which, since it deduced anything out of nothing, nullified the real significance of the Scriptures. This naturally gave rise to bitter antagonism between them and the Hebrews, who regarded these allegorical interpretations, this spirit of toleration for pagan systems, as an incipient revolt from Mosaism thinly disguised under a hybrid phraseology. But even in the case of these more advanced Jews it was the original Jewish element which predominated. Cf. SCHÜRER, *The Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ* (E. T.), Div. II, vol. II, pp. 281-291.

2. Cf. GILL, *Notices of the Jews by Classic Authors*, London, 1872.

in his oration for the extortionate and tyrannous Flaccus [1], and in that on the consular provinces calls them " a race born for slavery " [2]. Horace [3] sneers at their proselytism, their circumcision and their Sabbaths, and Seneca [4] calls them a " most abandoned race ". Juvenal [5] flings scornful allusion to their squalor, beggary, superstition, and idleness. Tacitus [6] in his history reproaches them with low cunning and strong hatred of all but their own. And no passage of the ancient authors, full as they are of dislike for the Jews, expresses so undisguised a bitterness, or is so thoroughly expressive of the way in which the Romans regarded this singular people as that in which the same Tacitus relates how Tiberius banished four thousand freedmen " infected with that superstition " into Sardinia to keep down the brigands of that island, with the distinct hope that the unhealthy climate might help to get rid of them, *et si ob gravitatem caeli interissent, vile damnum* [7]. As a result of this bitterness of feeling there were constant feuds and bloodsheds between the Jews and Gentiles. Josephus [8] tells us that there were frequent sanguinary encounters between the two, especially in Alexandria, Antioch, Cyrene, Caesarea, Ptolemais, Tyre, Hippos, and Gadara.

Now, were the Jews of Tarsus exempt from this hatred which was already so virulent among the Romans of that day ? The Jews of Tarsus were very numerous [9], having first settled there as part of the free governing city which Antiochus Epiphanes founded in 171 B. C. The Jews at this time dwelt in considerable bodies in various Hellenic cities, where they did not possess any rights as burgess citizens, but formed a simple association with synagogue or place of prayer by the seashore or on the bank of a stream (Philippi) which aroused attention and attracted proselytes though it was hated by the majority

1. *Pro Flacco*, XXVIII.
2. *De prov. cons.*, V.
3. *Sat.* I, IV, 143.
4. Cf. AUG. *De civ. Dei*, VII, 36.
5. *Sat.* VI, 542-547 ; XIV, 103-104.
6. *Hist.* V, 2-5.
7. *Ann.* II, 85.
8. *Wars of the Jews*, II, 18, 7, VII, 3, 3, II, 13, 7, II, 18, 5 (ed. WHISTON, *Josephus' Complete Works*, N. Y. 1853, pp. 638, 765, 624).
9. Cf. EPIPHANIUS, I, pp. 411-427 ; cf. also Rom. XVI, 7, 11, 21.

of the populace[1]. The Jews of Tarsus, however, were not mere resident strangers, but citizens with full burgess privileges[2], belonging to one of the tribes into which a Hellenic city was divided when it was founded or enlarged. No man could be a citizen except as a member of the tribe, and the tribal bond was intimate and sacred. The members were closely bound to one another by common religious rites which were performed at every meeting of the tribe. There was no possible way by which Jews who retained any religious or patriotic feeling or national pride could become citizens of a Greek city except by belonging to a tribe set apart in which they could control the religious rites and identify them with the services of the synagogue. No Jew could become a member of the ordinary tribe because he would have been obliged to participate in a pagan ritual, which even the most degraded Jew would never face. In fact, Epiphanius tells us that no Greek or Samaritan in Tarsus was allowed to live in the district of Galilee where the Jews were the strongest, so bitterly were the latter opposed to every other nationality [3].

All that we hear, therefore, about the Cilician Jews shows that they were intensely loyal, for we find a synagogue of theirs mentioned in Acts VI, 9, and that they were as capable as any of their brethren of repaying hate with double hatred, and scorn with double scorn. They would be the more likely to do so because of the condition of things around them. The belief in paganism was more firmly rooted in the provinces than in Italy and was especially vigorous at Tarsus. Though the seat of a celebrated schools of letters, this city was the metropolis of a province so low in universal estimation that it was counted among the three most villainous K's of antiquity — Kappadokia, Kilikia, Krete. What religion there was at this period had chiefly assumed an orgiastic and Oriental character[4], and the effect which it produced on Saint Paul was not one of tolerance or blunted insensibility. In fact, he who would know what was

1. The reader will find interesting information on these points in RAMSAY'S *The Cities of St. Paul* (New York, 1908).

2. Acts, XXI, 39; cf. PHILOSTRATUS, *The Life of Apollonius of Tyana*, VI, 34.

3. Ibid., o. c.

4. What indignant loathing and patriotic disgust must have been awakened in the hearts of a people when they saw that at the main festival of this

the aspect of paganism to one who had seen it in its characteristic developments need only read that most terrible passage of all Scripture, where under the glare of holy wrath we see paganism in all its wickedness, pollution, and deformity (Rom. I, 18-32).

Besides this horror inspired by the lowest aspects of heathen life, Saint Paul likewise derived from his acquaintance with it his deep conviction that earthly knowledge has no necessary connection with heavenly wisdom. Strabo[1], in giving us a glimpse of the professorial world at Tarsus in the days of pagan decadence, shows it as it was in the days of the Poggios and Filelfos of the Renaissance, a clique of narrow, unscrupulous, impure, and gossiping savants. In this city of great tradesmen and scholars alike, the philosophers and grammarians were more noisily active than the traffickers. Philostratus[2] tells us how they used to sit in bands along the docks of the Cydnus, clattering like " so many water-fowl ". How often Saint Paul, coming out of the ghetto at Tarsus, must have drawn near one of these knots of philosophers and marvelled at their trivial discussions. And how frivolous this apotheosis of pedantism must have appeared to him. It was no doubt his Tarsian reminiscences which added emphasis to his reiterated warnings that the wise men of heathendom " became vain in their thoughts, and their foolish heart was darkened, for professing themselves to be wise they became foolish " (Rom. I, 21, 22), that " the wisdom of this world is foolishness with God. For it is written : I will catch the wise in their own craftiness. And again : the Lord knoweth the thoughts of the wise that they are vain " (I Cor. III, 19, 20). He reiterates again and again that the Greeks seek after wisdom and regard the Cross

---

degraded cult the effeminate Sardanapalus and the masculine Semiramis were worshiped with rites which externally resembled the pure rejoicings of the feast of Tabernacles. By the gates of Tarsus, at Anchialus, Paul could see the idol of this shameless religion. There a marble statue represented Sardanapalus as a woman clad in the robe of a Lydian girl, with arms outstretched, and snapping his fingers with all a reveler's abandonment to debauchery. Underneath an inscription in the Assyrian tongue expressed the whole moral of this cult : " Drink, eat, and enjoy ; all else is naught ". Cf. STRABO, *Geography*, XIV, 5, 9 (ed. WOLTERS, vol. II, p. 988).

1. *Geography*, XIV, 5, 14 (ed. WOLTERS, vol. II, p. 992).

2. *The Life of Apollonius of Tyana*, I, 7 (trans. CONYBEARE, N. Y. 1912, p. 17).

as foolishness, yet that the foolishness of God is wiser than men, and that God has chosen the foolish things of this world to confound the wise ; and that when the world by wisdom knew not God, it pleased God by the foolishness of the preaching to save them that believe (I Cor. I, 22, 23, 25, 27, II, 14, IV, 10).

Not only was Saint Paul opposed to the wisdom of the Greeks, but whenever he indulges in any autobiographical reflections never is there a trace of the Hellenist to be detected, but he is always careful to demonstrate in his Epistles the purity of his Hebrew descent and the strictness of his Judaism. In the Epistle to the Philippians III, 4-6, when enumerating his advantages according to the flesh, he makes the following significant gradation : unlike the proselyte he was circumcised the eighth day and thereby belongs to the family of Abraham ; in this family he belongs to Jacob's descendants, the race of Israel ; within this race he has sprung from the faithful tribe of Benjamin, which in the schism after Solomon's death united to the tribe of Juda to form the kingdom in which the great religious traditions of the Old Testament were kept in all their purity ; finally, among the descendants of these two Jewish tribes he belongs to the sect of the Pharisees, who, unlike the Saducees, interpreted the Law more religiously and observed it more diligently ; far from being a Hellenist he was a " Hebrew of the Hebrews " ; as regards Judaic enthusiasm he had even persecuted the Church, and as regards legal righteousness he proved himself above all reproach. A similar gradation he makes out in II Cor. XI, 22, where he claims to be an adherent of the same nationality, a member of the same theocracy, and a sharer of the same Messianic hopes as his Judaizing opponents : " Are they Hebrews (in language and tradition) ? So am I. Are they Israelites (in creed and descent) ? So am I. Are they of the seed of Abraham (partakers of the Messianic hopes) ? So am I ". He sprang from a family in which piety was hereditary (II Tim. I, 3), for his forefathers were good Jews who worshipped the one true God. Hence his parents being true Israelites could have no intercourse with the schools of Tarsus and the teachers of perdition[1].

1. Josephus states that Moses already had laid down prescriptions for the education of Jewish boys : " He commanded to instruct children in the

Of those moral struggles and spiritual experiences through which Saint Paul must have passed during this period in which " he lived as a Pharisee " we also have traces in his Epistles. We know well the kind of life that lies behind that expression, the minute and intense scrupulosity of the observance of the law and ritual. And for Paul there was no distinction between the relative importance of the written and oral, of the moral and ceremonial law. To every precept — and they were countless — unqualified obedience was due : " Cursed is every one that abideth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them " (Gal. III, 10) — that certainly represents his original position. If on his accuracy of observance depended the coming of the Messias, then surely the Messias should come, for he tells the Galatians : " I made progress in the Jews' religion above many of my equals in my own nation, being more abundantly zealous for the traditions of my fathers " (Gal. I, 14 ; Acts XXII, 3). So fierce indeed was his zeal that he even broke away from the advice of his more tolerant master on the occasion of the Apostle's trial before the Sanhedrin (Acts V, 38-39), and took a leading part in the persecution of the Way. Yet we trace in his Epistles how bitterly he felt the hollowness of outward obedience, how awful and how burdensome had been to him the " curse of the Law ", and how trouble-

---

elements of knowledge (reading and writing) ; to teach them to walk according to the laws ,and to know the deeds of their forefathers — the latter that they might imitate them, the former that growing up with the laws they might not transgress them nor have the excuse of ignorance " (quoted in SCHÜRER. *The Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ* (E. T.), Div. II, vol. II, p. 47). Similarly Philo tells us that the Jews " are taught so as to speak from their swaddling clothes by their parents, teachers and those who bring them up, even before instruction in the sacred laws and the unwritten customs, to believe in God, the one Father and Creator of the world " (quoted in SCHÜRER, o. c., p. 48). Moreover, in the year 64 Joshua ben Gamla, the high priest, enacted that teachers of boys should be appointed in every province and in every town — a measure which presupposes a longer existence of boys' schools — and that children of the age of six or seven years should be brought to them. Cf. SCHÜRER, o. c., p. 48. In this connection it is also worthy of note that the Jews in the education of their young were so scrupulous that they held concerning books of their own hagiographs, such, for instance, as the book of Esther, that they were doubtful reading. They would not allow their youth even to open the Song of Solomon before the age of twenty-one. Nothing is therefore more certain than that a " Pharisee of Pharisees ", even though his boyhood was spent in heathen Tarsus, would have been allowed barely to know the existence of the soundest portion of Greek letters, if even these.

some these years were to him. Even when many years of struggling and suffering are over, we still catch in his Epistles the mournful echoes of those days of stress and storm. We hear them when he talks of the " curse of the Law ", a menacing bond, which God had forever cancelled by nailing it to the Cross (Col. II, 10, 14, 15, 20), a feud between Jew and Gentile, hindering access to the Father (Eph. II, 14-16). We hear them when he tells us of the struggle between the flesh and the spirit, between the law of sin in his members and that law of God which though holy and just he had found unto death (Rom. VII, 7 ff) If after he had found Christ and learned that " there is no condemnation to those that are in Jesus Christ " (Rom. VIII, 1), he still felt the power and continuity of the inferior law striving to degrade his life into that captivity to the law of sin from which Christ had set him free, through what hours of anguish must he not have passed when he knew of no other dealing of God with his soul than the impossible and deathful commandment.

That Saint Paul was a Jew in culture is clear from almost every verse of his Epistles[1]. He reckons time by the Jewish calendar, and makes constant allusions to Jewish customs, laws, and festivals. Though he wrote in Greek, it is by no means the Greek of the schools, or the Greek which in spite

1. In this connection it might be asked : if Saint Paul ever came under the influence of Hellenism, as the critics claim, when was his mind so affected ? His career in Jerusalem most probably began when he was thirteen years of age, for he says that he was " brought up " in this city at the feet of Gamaliel : " I am a Jew, born at Tarsus in Cilicia, but brought up in this city (ἀνατεθραμμένος δὲ ἐν τῇ πόλει ταύτῃ), at the feet of Gamaliel, taught (πεπαιδευμένος) according to the truth of the law of the fathers, zealous for the law " (Acts, XXII, 3). RAMSAY, *Pauline Studies*, pp. 67-69, in order to make his theory more plausible, places Saint Paul's departure from Tarsus at a much later date. He bases his contention on the meaning of the term " youth " in Acts XXVI, 4 : " And my life indeed from my youth (ἐκ νεότητος), which was the beginning among my own nation in Jerusalem, all the Jews do know " The term νεότης, however, has not a sufficiently definite meaning to make this opinion probable. On the other hand, thirteen was the age at which a Jewish boy, if he were destined for the position of a rabbi, entered the school of some great master. Hence it is probable that when Saint Paul reached his thirteenth year, the age at which a child became a " son of the law ", or, in other words, was initiated into the numberless traditions of his ancestors, he was sent to Jerusalem to study under the famous Rabban Gamaliel, and lived probably during this time with his married sister (Acts XXIII, 16). Cf. JACQUIER, *Histoire des livres du Nouveau Testament* (Paris, 1904), vol. I, p. 51, *Études de critique et de philologie du Nouveau Testament* (Paris, 1920), p. 89 ff., PRAT, o. c., vol. I[9], p. 20 ff.

of its antitheses and paronomasias would have been found tolerable by the rhetoricians of his native city ; in fact, a Tarsian professor or a philosopher of Athens would have ridiculed his Hebraic peculiarities, awkward anacolutha, harshly mingled metaphors, strange forms, and irregular constructions. That there are some striking resemblances between Saint Paul's Epistles and the diatribe, the form of preaching used by the wandering Cynic and Stoic philosopher, is no doubt true. The salient features of the latter such as the dialogistic form of argument, question and answer, objection foreseen and answered, antithesis and parallelism, comparison and simile, irony, exposition, and exhortation, are all to be found in Saint Paul's Epistles. But the differences are more numerous than the similarities. Thus the method of question and answer is never developed by Saint Paul, as is done in the diatribe, until the climax is reached and final conclusion is drawn. So too the parallel method is frequently interrupted by the interpolation of Old Testament quotations and the intrusion of fundamental Pauline doctrines. Then again, there is no approach to the carefully forged scheme of the diatribe with its descriptive and hortative sections and their scientific connections. In fact, in some of Saint Paul's Epistles the expository section has no bearing on the hortatory, while in the First Epistle to the Corinthians the two elements are not kept apart at all. Saint Paul also differs from the philosopher in not appealing on any large scale to the example of historical personages ; his sense of power in Christ is so overwhelming that it is superfluous to set before his hearers a crowd of historical or mythical examples. Nor do we find in him the artistry of the Greek preacher, the wealth of color, the dramatic instinct, the faculty of creating pictures of delightful and degrading scenes, and the jest and the sense of humor are entirely absent. If he uses irony, he never pours out the vials of contempt on his philosophical opponent as did the Cynic, and he seldom resorts to vituperation because of the consciousness of his own imperfection[1]. And surely the most inspired of the Apostle's direct exhortations as well as those immortal passages of his of matchless grandeur and passionate emotion owe very little to the Greek address. Whenever he uses the Greek form of preaching, it was because this or that point of his would the more easily reach its

1. Cf. PRAT, art. *Paul et le paulinisme*, DApFC, fasc. XVIII, col. 1645 ff.

objective. We can well understand how Saint Paul would realize the immense advantage of presenting his Gospel in a city like Corinth, for instance, in a garb which was so familiar to its citizens. And if we are to do justice to his own famous statement, " I have become all things to all men that I might save all " (I Cor. IX, 22), we must recognize his willingness to put himself *en rapport* with those whom he sought to win for Christ. An able man such as he was, with a keenness of sympathy and vividness of insight, travelling through the world of his day, mixing with many classes of persons, he could not but notice what he saw and heard[1]. Living in the midst of Greek learning, and breathing its atmosphere, he was to that extent conscious of it and acquainted with it, but there is very little in the Pauline literature that points to anything like an education in Greek philosophy and a training in Greek letters. The Hellenic influences do not touch the life and essence of Paulinism.

B. The above survey is sufficient, we think, to show the impossibility of Saint Paul's deriving from Hellenism his fundamental doctrines, especially his teaching concerning the Divinity of Christ. In fact, the manner in which Saint Paul speaks of Christ, Whose death had always been a scandal and stumbling-block to the proud Pharisee and persecutor of the Christians, is a phenomenon which seems to contradict all laws of psychology and all analogies of history. When Saul became a Christian, six or seven years at most had elapsed since the Passion · when he began his public preaching he was not more than ten years from it, and when he wrote his first letters only twenty-two years separated him from the memorable date. Jesus Christ, his senior by only a few years, was his contemporary in the true sense of the word. The Apostle's Christology, be it noted, was never the subject of controversy ; we have no

1. It is a singular fact, however, that unlike David or even Our Lord Saint Paul was wholly uninfluenced by the scenes of beauty and majesty amid which he lived and travelled. The expulsive power and paramount importance of the mighty spiritual and moral truths which it was his great mission to proclaim prevented him from showing scarcely the faintest gleam of delight in the wonders of nature ; his was a soul in which the burning heat of a great transfusing purpose calcined every other thought, desire, and admiration. Hence the metaphors which he draws from Hellenic life must have been especially suitable to Saint Paul for winning others to Christ and for his becoming all things to all men (cf. I Cor. IV, 9, VII, 31, IX. 24-27 ; Phil. III, 15).

evidence of a Pauline conception gaining ascendancy over a primitive conception ; in the whole New Testament there is no trace of a conflict, and this remarkable absence of struggle can only be explained if the two were essentially the same[1]. Hence the belief in the divinity of Christ in the primitive Church was not due to any Pauline influence but found its justification in the Divine Jesus Himself. For it is inconceivable that the early Christians came to regard the man Jesus as a divine being immediately after His death. Such an apotheosis of Jesus, as even critics of the most thoroughgoing naturalistic principles admit, would be absolutely unique, preternaturally rapid, an unparalleled in the religious history of the race[2]. Neither the past history of the Jews, nor the Palestinian surroundings, nor the circumstances of Jesus' death, favored an apotheosis. The serious monotheism of the Jews did not easily lend itself to deifications, but regarded the adoration of man, be he king or emperor, as the abomination of desolation. The Jews were hopelessly refractory to similar cults, and were always repelled by acts which to them were more horrible than death. The early Christians, too, were not less firm in this regard, and often sealed with their own blood the refusal to render to man honors which were reserved to God alone.

---

1. As to the doctrinal differences between Saint Paul and Jesus cf. PRAT, art. *Paul et le paulinisme*, DApFC, fasc. XVIII, col. 1634 ff.

2. The problem of the relation of the Epistles to the Synoptics has in later years taken on a new aspect. It is now maintained by the critics that the gospels, especially the fourth, were written after Saint Paul's Epistles, and that they were affected by Pauline teaching. To a certain extent it is no longer the historical Jesus Whom the gospels describe, but the Pauline Christ. Accordingly, there is not a single document which presents a pre-Pauline conception of Christ. But this supposition has not even a semblance of truth. In order that Pauline conceptions should be able to affect the evangelical material by additions and modifications it is necessary to suppose that the material was at the time in a fairly fluid state, capable of responding to the moulding of a later scheme of thought, and that effective contact was established between the two. But granted these conditions, is it possible to explain how the traces of Pauline influence are so few in number ? Why did it leave so much of the gospel material unaltered and especially those passages which now suggest antinomy between Our Lord and Saint Paul ? In the supposed Pauline passages the writers are quite unaware that one view is being replaced by another. This conclusion is supported by the positive evidence which has recently been urged for dating the gospels at a time when the Pauline Epistles, even if some of them had already been written, could not have been collected and begun to dominate the Church at large.

Saint Paul himself energetically protests against the divinisation of man : " There is no God but one. For although there be that are called gods, either in heaven or on earth (for there be gods many, and lords many) ; yet to us there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we unto him ; and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things and we by him " (I Cor. VIII, 4, 6). Hence when Saint Paul attributes to Christ such titles as " God ", " Lord ", or " Lord God ", " Saviour ", terms, which had been so much abused by the aberrant paganism and polytheism of his day, he retains for them all the value which they have in the Bible and where they designate Jehovah ; he attributes to them a meaning which is authorized by Hebrew monotheism coupled with personal distinctions which Christian revelation recognizes in the bosom of the divine life. In fact, Saint Paul clearly tells us that the Gospel which he preached, and of which *Jesus Christ, the Divine Redeemer, was the central point,* was derived not from any human sources but from revelation : " I give you to understand, brethren, that the gospel which was preached by me is not according to man. For neither did I receive it of man, nor did I learn it ; but by the revelation of Jesus Christ " (Gal. I, 11, 12) [1].

C. Nor is there any evidence to show that Saint Paul's gospel differed from that of the early disciples and apostles of our Lord. Immediately after his vision of Christ on the way

---

1. In this regard it must be noted that the Apostle was favored with many revelations during his whole apostolic career (cf. Acts XXII, 18 ; Gal. II, 2 ; Acts XVI, 6, 7, 9-10, XVIII, 9, XX, 22-23, XIX, 21, XXIII, 11). To these revelations is to be added above all the grand ecstasy recorded in Second Corinthians which coincided approximately with the beginning of his active apostolate and which was perhaps an immediate preparation for his mission among the Gentiles. Not only, however, was Saint Paul's whole missionary career under divine guidance, but certain points of his teaching he received by direct revelation. The institution of the Eucharist, the indissolubility of marriage, the destiny of the just at the Parousia, certain great facts about the Resurrection (I. Cor. XV, 22 ; I Thess. IV, 15), the direct vision of the Saviour not only risen from the dead but exalted on the right hand of God, and especially the central and peculiar fact of his teaching, " the mystery of Christ ", the Redemption and free offer of salvation to the Gentiles, were undoubtedly all subjects of special revelation. As to the life, miracles, discourses, and the rest of Our Lord's teaching, these the Apostle could learn through human channels, for the history of revelation is against the fact that it is ever given unnecessarily.

to Damascus, he was visited by a disciple named Ananias, who laid hands on him, baptized him, and gave him instructions. And the Acts continue: "And he was with the disciples that were at Damascus, for some days. And immediately he preached Jesus in the synagogues that He is the Son of God" (Acts IX, 10). In the year 38 we find Saint Paul at Jerusalem, spending two weeks with Peter (ἀνῆλθον ἱστορῆσαι Κηφᾶν) and making inquiries concerning the ministry and resurrection of Christ (Gal. I, 18). Again, in the year 42 the faithful of the Church at Jerusalem, hearing that an important body of converts had been formed at Antioch, sent Barnabas to organize the new community. And "after a great multitude was added to the Lord, Barnabas went to Tarsus to seek Saul; whom when he had found he brought to Antioch. And they conversed there in the church a whole year, and they *taught* a great multitude, so that at Antioch the disciples were first named Christians" (Acts XI, 25-26). Hence Saint Paul's teaching in this nascent Christian Church must have been similar to that of Barnabas, for it would be an untenable paradox to maintain that Paul was here an independent teacher. The collaboration of Saint Paul and Barnabas was not limited, however, to the common preaching at Antioch, but we find them both together on Saint Paul's first missionary journey. They preached in Cyprus, in Pisidia and Lycaonia, returning finally to Antioch, where they abode "no small time with the disciples" (Acts XIV, 27). Hence Saint Paul knew whatever was known about Christ and His teaching in the Christian Church of Antioch.

Some critics who insist upon the radical distinction between Saint Paul's gospel and that preached by the original apostles appeal to the following passage in Gal. II, 7, 8: "To me was committed the gospel of the uncircumcision, as to Peter was that of the circumcision. For he who wrought in Peter to the apostleship of the circumcision wrought in me also among the Gentiles". But who does not see that here Saint Paul meant to indicate, as the equivalent terms substituted in the succeeding verse show, not the dogmatic content but the twofold destination of the gospel. The legitimate existence of two apostleships, one appointed for the evangelisation of the Jew and the other for that of the Gentile, Saint Paul indeed did admit, but never of two essentially different gospels (Rom. I, 16;

Gal. I, 7-9)[1]. Moreover, the Apostle ascribes these two apostleships and the abundant fruit they bore to one and the same act of God. If two hostile gospels are in question it would have to be admitted that Saint Paul attributes them equally to God as their supreme author. Hence the Apostles could consistently give each other " the right hand of fellowship (Gal. II, 9) since they felt themselves to be standing on a common basis. Saint Paul in another place expressly says that he went to Jerusalem by revelation and communicated to the other apostles the *gospel* which he preached among the Gentiles " lest perhaps he should run or had run in vain " (Gal. II, 2). In a passage of First Corinthians the Apostle shows how he estimated the work done by others alongside with himself and that which had been done before him in the Church (I Cor. III, 10, 11). So far from reproaching St. Peter for having built on a different foundation, he reckons him among those who were laboring on the building of God ; and to God also he leaves the office of appraising the work of each (I Cor. III, 22)[2]. In his Epistle

1. Moreover, we must not suppose that the Christianity of the Gentile world was pure Paulinism. We must not ignore those missionaries of whom many are unknown to history by name, but who labored efficiently before and at the same time as Saint Paul. Before the missionary activity of the Apostle began, Philip the Evangelist had already admitted the Ethiopian eunuch, and St. Peter had baptized Cornelius and his circle. And in the Acts we read that some of those who were dispersed by the persecution that arose on the occasion of Stephen's martyrdom ," when they entered unto Antioch, spoke also to the Greeks, preaching the Lord Jesus " (Acts XI, 19-20). In the Acts, it is true, Saint Paul's labors are described at great length as we would naturally expect from St. Luke, who was a follower and admirer of the great Apostle, while the author's treatment of the other apostles leaves much to be desired. But it would be a mistake to conclude from the incomplete narratives of the Acts that Saint Paul was the only missionary. We know that the apostles of Jerusalem sent St. Peter and St. John to labor in Samaria (Acts VIII, 15), and that the former made extensive journeys (Acts IX, 32). Again we read that St. Peter visited Antioch (Gal. II, 11), and very probably labored also at Corinth (cf. I Cor. I, 12, IX, 15). To Rome the gospel message was probably brought already by the *advenae Romani* who were present at Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost (Acts II, 10). When the Apostle wrote his epistle to the Romans, the Church in that city must already have been of many years standing (Rom. I, 8, XVI, 19) ; yet the Epistle shows no evidence that Saint Paul was conscious of preaching a new or different gospel to them.

2. The rebuke of St. Peter at Antioch, apparently the strongest evidence of a conflict between Saint Paul and the original apostles, is rather to be regarded as evidence to the contrary (Gal. II, 11-12). The passage shows that in principle St. Peter recognized that the Law of Moses was not binding on Christians (Gal. II, 9). When he withdrew from the Gentile Christians to observe the Mosaic law of clean and unclean foods, it was not a question of

to the Ephesians Saint Paul calls this primitive foundation " the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner-stone " (Eph. II, 20). Hence the attempt to establish a radical distinction between the original apostles and Saint Paul especially in regard to the latter's doctrine concerning *Christ, the Divine Redeemer, Who is the central point of his gospel,* has little foundation to support it [1].

II. That the attempt to derive Saint Paul's gospel from Hellenism or to show that it was independent of that of the other Apostles has proved a failure is to-day recognized by many critics [2]. However, Protestantism, the religion of " spir-

---

principle, but of expediency, a concession to the scruples of Jewish Christians. The words in Gal. II, 14-18 presuppose that at first St. Peter took up the same position in regard to the Jews as Saint Paul (Acts XI, 4, XV, 7 ff.) and that only in this single instance, from a fear of man which he more than once evinces, he weakly gave way to the Jewish Christians. We must also remember that St. Peter was an apostle of the Jewish Christians who had not yet been absolved from the Mosaic observances, and that his action was justifiable on the principles laid down elsewhere by Saint Paul himself (I. Cor. IX, 19-24, VIII, 13). And on the other hand, though Saint Paul condemned the Law, it was his hand that penned such beautiful passages concerning Israel as Rom. IX, 1-6, XI, 24-32. He kept up constant communion with the Church at Jerusalem, and faithfully cared for its wants by instituting frequent collections among the Gentile churches for the Jewish Christians (Gal. II, 10 ; Rom. X, 25 ; I Cor. XVI ; II Cor. VIII, 9). The Gentile Christians in Antioch, Macedonia, and Greece, ministered joyfully and often beyond their power to the Church in Judea.

1. But why did the Judaizers appeal to the original apostles against Saint Paul ? If the former were as Pauline as Paul himself, why should they be preferred to him ? The explanation is not difficult to find. It was the life, not the teaching of the original apostles which appeared to support the contention of the Judaizers. Outwardly and to a superficial observer the early Christians in Jerusalem continued as a mere Jewish sect. Inwardly, however, Christianity was from the beginning no mere continuation of Judaism, but a new religion. It was only when the Christian Church began to transcend the Jewish bounds that the division became apparent.

2. If as is claimed Saint Paul transformed the original gospel, it is strange that his teaching left no preponderant influence on the Apostolic Fathers. If we search the Didache and the Epistle to Barnabas we can hardly detect any Pauline influence in them. In the Epistles of Ignatius, Polycarp, and Justin the Martyr, we have only a few brief quotations or reminiscences. In the great writers of the second century as Irenaeus, Tertullian, and Clement of Alexandria, we find numerous quotations but not disproportionate to the rest of the NT. Cf. LIGHTFOOT, *The Apostolic Fathers* (New York, 1890) Part II, vol. II, pp. 520-526, Part. I, vol. II, pp. 515-517. Nor is the type of doctrine that prevailed in the ancient Christian Church of a distinctively Pauline form. The Apostle's Creed, the Nicene and Constantinopolitan Creed,

itual experience " will have no dogmas ; consequently Saint Paul's doctrine concerning the preexistent and divine Christ " ought to fall, it must fall, it will fall ". Hence another means has been found by German critics [1], followed by Rashdall [2] and others, to explain away the Apostle's teaching concerning the Person of Christ. We are now told that Saint Paul in the imaginary vision of Damascus transferred his conceptions of the Messianic heavenly man, derived from the Jewish Apocalypses, to the historical Jesus of primitive Christianity. The Rabbinic preexistent Messias, we are told, was characterized by four fundamental notes: he was celestial, because coming from heaven and destined to return thither after a period of terrestrial existence ; he was spiritual, because he was not only inspired by the spirit of God but was himself spirit ; he was the divine exemplar on whose model all men would be formed, and, finally, he was true man, possessing a luminous and ethereal body. But here again Saint Paul stands adamant against the vagaries of modern thought. In fact, Protestantism in its mad efforts to destroy the supernatural character of Christianity often knows no limit, and indulges in hypotheses which not only have the *cachet de l'absurde* stamped upon them but which tend ultimately to nullify one another. Thus we have been told by Ramsay[3] that " the Pauline thought is wholly inconceivable in a mere narrow Hebrew and wholly inexplicable without an education in Greek philosophy ". According to Rashdall[4] " St. Paul's theories rest mainly upon exegesis, largely mistaken exegesis or mistranslation of the Old Testament..... the premisses rest upon exegesis : the logic by which inferences are made from them is rabbinic logic : the exegesis is rabbinic exegesis..... we cannot accept the conclusions which he reached by those means ". According to Morgan [5] " Anthropological

contain no specialties of so-called Paulinism. Cf. HARNACK, *History of Dogma* (E. T. Boston, 1899), vol. I, pp. 284, 148-149, WEIZSÄCKER, *Apostolic Age* (E. T. London, 1912), vol. I, p. 173.

1. PFLEIDERER, *Das Urchristentum*, vol. I, p. 226 ff. Père LAGRANGE, RB, 1897, pp. 468-472, refutes this theory in his review of HOLTZMANN's *Neutestamentliche Theologie* (vol. II, p. 82).

2. *The Idea of Atonement*, p. 128 ff., HEADLAM, *St. Paul and Christianity*, pp. 62-63.

3. *The Cities of St. Paul*, p. 34 ; cf. *ibid.*, p. 235, and *The Teaching of Paul in Terms of the Present Day*, pp. 31, 40-49.

4. *The Idea of Atonement*, pp. 120-121.

5. *The Religion and Theology of Paul*, p. 162.

dualism, miraculous transformation, death and resurrection with a saviour-god — these conceptions came to him (Saint Paul) not from the Old Testament or from Judaism, but from the ecstatic, mystical piety of Philo and the Oriental cults ". According to Harnack[1] " notwithstanding Paul's Greek culture, his conception of Christianity in its deepest ground is independent of Hellenism " Finally the verdict of Andrews[2]: " if Paulinism is, as we are sometimes told, merely a *crambe repetita* — a stale dish — of Jewish sophistries and the commonplaces of Greek philosophy, the influence which it has wielded upon the Church and upon the world becomes an insoluble enigma, and we are driven to the conclusion that, after all, it is not truth but superstition that prevails ". The above quotations speak for themselves, and we refuse to attempt to reconciliate them. Suffice it to note that they are an eloquent testimony to and confirmation of the Apostle's claim that " the gospel which was preached by him was no according to man, neither did he receive it of man, nor did he learn it ; but by the revelation of Jesus Christ " (Gal. I, II, 12).

Although Saint Paul never severed his connections with his kinsmen according to the flesh (Rom. IX, 3), yet we must remember that after his conversion " the old things had passed away, and all things were made new ", that if once he knew " Christ according to the flesh, now he knew him so no longer " (II Cor. V, 17, 16). The things that in Judaism were " gain to him, the same he has counted loss for Christ. Furthermore he counts all things to be but loss for the excellent knowledge of Jesus Christ his Lord, for whom he has suffered the loss of all things, and counts them as dung, that he may gain Christ, and may be found in him, not having his justice, which is of the law, but that which is of the faith of Christ Jesus, which is of God, justice in faith " (Phil. III, 7-9). He is so entirely freed from the modes and categories of Jewish thought that he can regard the Law as an instrument of Sin and of wrath (Rom. IV, 15, V, 20, VII, 7 ff. ; I Cor. XV, 56 ; Gal. III, 10), as a mere interlude in the plan of salvation (Gal. III, 24), propositions, which would have sounded as sheer blasphemy to him before his conversion. In his polemics with the

1. Quoted in ROSTRON, *The Christology of St. Paul*, p. 17.
2. *The Value of the Theology of St. Paul for Modern Thought*, p. 55.

Judaizers he frequently appeals to the Old Testament, not indeed to show that his own doctrines were derived therefrom, but to prove that the former read the sacred books with a veil upon their face, that the Old Testament if properly understood really supports his own position, that the principles that are at work in the new dispensation were already active in the old. Thus he pictures Abraham as being justified gratuitously not by works but by faith, that the spiritual paternity of the father of the nations was independent of the Law, and that the promise given directly to Abraham by God was superior to the Law which was ordained by angels in the hand of a mediator (Rom. IV ; Gal. III). Hence to represent the Christian Paul as a Jew pure and unalloyed is to miss what in his life was central and essential, namely Jesus Christ, the Redeemer (cf. I Cor. II, 2, III, 11 ; II Cor. IV, 5 ; Gal. II, 20, VI, 14).

Much less justifiable is the attempt to explain the divine and preexistent Christ of Saint Paul by the preexistent Messias of the Rabbinic vagaries. In the first place, the Jewish conception referred not to a real but to an *ideal* preexistence[1]. The Christ of the Pauline conception, however, is a real being, for He creates and conserves the world, is sent by God, exchanges the splendors of heaven for the poverty of earth, etc. Secondly, if before His Incarnation Christ had been man and consequently a mere creature, how could Saint Paul say that everything without exception in heaven and on earth was created by and for Him ? How in that case could He become man by being born ? if His Resurrection was merely a return to the state which He enjoyed before the Incarnation, what significance can we attribute to the former ? More time need not be lost here, we think, in considering further these inventions of the " New Theology ", which, instead of explaining and clarifying the Scriptures, hopelessly obscure and confuse them. Let us rather consider more in detail the testimony of the inspired Apostle [2].

---

1. Cf. FELDER, *Jesus Christus*[2], vol. I, p. 425 ff.

2. For a study of Christology in general cf. GRANDMAISON, art. *Jésus Christ*, DApFC, fasc. XI, col. 1288-1538, MICHEL, art. *Jésus-Christ*, DTC, vol. VIII, col. 1108-1411, VERHELST, *La divinité de Jésus-Christ*, Étude Apologétique, Bruxelles, 1919, LAHOUSSE, *Apologie de la divinité de Jésus-Christ* Antwerp, 1923 ; for a study of Pauline Christology cf. LEBRETON, *Les origines du dogme de la Trinité*[4], p. 352 ff., PRAT, o. c., vol. II[6], p. 131 ff., LATTEY,

Art. II. — JESUS CHRIST GOD.

According to Saint Paul Christ preexisted from all eternity in the form of God : τοῦτο φρονεῖτε ἐν ὑμῖν ὃ καὶ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, ὃς ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων [1] οὐχ ἁρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ, ἀλλὰ ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν μορφὴν δούλου λαβών, ἐν ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων γενόμενος καὶ σχήματι εὑρεθεὶς ὡς ἄνθρωπος (Phil. II, 5-7). This great dogmatic passage was always considered by the Fathers and ecclesiastical writers as referring to the preexistent Christ ; the κένωσις itself was understood as consisting in the Incarnation, and was consequently attributed to the divine will. The general bearing of the passage is clear. In the first place, μορφή [2] as opposed to σχῆμα, denotes in the Pauline Epistles something intimate and profound, something stable and permanent, something inseparable from the essence. Thus the great and entire change of the inner life, otherwise described as being born again or as being created anew, is spoken of as a conversion of μορφή, of σχῆμα never : thus " He predestinated them to be made conformable (συμμόρφους) to the image of his Son " (Rom VIII, 29) ; " until Christ be formed (μορφωθῇ) in you " (Gal IV, 19) ; " we are transformed (μεταμορφούμεθα) into the same image " (II Cor. III, 18) ; " being made conformable (συμμορφιζόμενος) to his death " (Phil. III, 10) (cf. Mt. XVII, 2 ; Mk. IX, 2). Σχῆμα, on the other hand suggests

---

art. *De divinitate Christi*, VDni, 1923, pp. 198-206, Williams, J. H., *The Divinity of Christ in the New Testament* (a refutation of Unitarian errors), *passim*.

1. Compare the analogous use of ὑπάρχων with the principal verb in Lk. XXIII, 50 : Καὶ ἰδοὺ ἀνὴρ ὀνόματι Ἰωσηφ βουλευτὴς ὑπάρχων, οὗτος οὐκ ἦν συνκατατεθειμένος τῇ βουλῇ ; I Cor. XI, 7 : ἀνὴρ μὲν γὰρ οὐκ ὀφείλει καταλύπτεσθαι τὴν κεφαλήν, εἰκὼν καὶ δόξα θεοῦ ὑπάρχων ; II Cor. VIII, 17 : σπουδαιότερος δὲ ὑπάρχων αὐθαίρετος ἐξῆλθεν πρὸς ὑμᾶς, XII, 16 : ἀλλὰ ὑπάρχων πανοῦργος δόλῳ ὑμᾶς ἔλαβον ; Gal. I, 14 : προέκοπτον .. περισσοτέρως ὑπάρχων, II, 14 : εἰ σὺ Ἰουδαῖος ὑπάρχων ἐθνικῶς ζῇς. From these passages we can conclude that that the state expressed by ὑπάρχων is anterior to the action indicated by the principal verb, and that it still continues at and after the moment denoted by the latter.

2. Plato, *Republ.* II, p. 381 c says that it is impossible for a God to change his form : μένει ἀεὶ ἁπλῶς ἐν τῇ αὑτοῦ μορφῇ. Philo, *Leg. ad Caium*, 14, vol. II, p. 561, in speaking of the true God says : Οὐ γὰρ ὥσπερ τὸ νόμισμα παράκομμα, καὶ θεοῦ μορφὴ γίνεται. Josephus, *Contra Apion*, II, 22 : Ὁ θεὸς ἔργοις μὲν καὶ χάρισιν ἐναργής ..... μορφὴν δὲ καὶ μέγεθος ἡμῖν ἀφανέστατος. Hence the form is something that belongs to the essence of a thing, something inseparable from the divinity.

the idea of something changeable, fleeting, unsubstantial : thus the " fashion of this world " which passes away is τὸ σχῆμα τοῦ κόσμου τούτου (I Cor. VII, 31) ; to fall in with the fashion of this world is συνσχηματίζεσθαι τῷ αἰῶνι τούτῳ (Rom. XII, 2) ; the fictitious illusory transformation whereby evil assumes the mask of good is described by the thrice repeated word μετασχηματίζεσθαι (II Cor. XI, 13, 14, 15). The distinction which thus appears from a review of each word separately is seen more clearly from those passages where they occur together (cf. Rom. XII, 2 ; Phil. III, 21) ; μορφή is that which is essential and intrinsic, σχῆμα that which is accidental and outward. In fact, the Fathers unanimously understand the "form of God" as being identical with the divinity, and use as synonyms of μορφή *substance of God* (οὐσία)[1], *nature of God* (φύσις)[2], or *divinity* (θεότης)[3]. The same conclusion follows from the contrast involved in the passage : since it is a man in the true sense of the word Who has undergone the ignominy of the Cross, μορφὴ δούλου must denote φύσις δούλου, a fact, which was so clear to the Fathers that they appealed to this text to prove against the Docetists the reality of Christ's human nature ; now just as μορφή δούλου denotes man *simpliciter* so also μορφή θεοῦ signifies God. Since the " form of God " can neither be acquired nor lost Christ preexisted from all eternity (Heb. XIII, 8), and being on an equality with God (τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ) had a right to divine honors.

Not only did Christ preexist in the " form of God " but He is also the " image of the invisible (cf. I Tim. VI, 16) God ",

---

1. St. Basil, *Contra Eunom.* I, 18; Migne, XXIX, 552 : Ἐγὼ γὰρ τὸ ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχειν ἴσον δύνασθαι τῷ ἐν οὐσίᾳ θεοῦ ὑπάρχειν φημί.

St. Cyril of Alexandria, *De Incarnatione Domini,* 10 ; LXXV, 1432 : Ἡ μορφὴ τοῦ θεοῦ οὐσία τοῦ θεοῦ.

St. Gregory of Nyssa, *Contra Eunom.* 4 ; XLV, 672 : Ἡ δὲ μορφὴ τοῦ θεοῦ ταὐτὸν τῇ οὐσίᾳ πάντως ἐστίν.

Cf. also Theoderet, *Dialog.* 2 ; LXXXIII, 189.

2. St. Hilary, *De Trinit.* XII, 6 ; X, 437 : " Esse in forma Dei non alia intelligentia est quam in Dei manere natura ".

Cf. also St. John Chrysostom, *Homil.,* VI, 1 and 3, St. John Damascene, *Advers. Nestor,* 10 ; XCV, 1193, Victorin, *Adv. Arium,* 4 ; VIII, 1119.

3. St. Ambrose, *De Fide,* V, 8 ; XVI, 698 : " Quid est in Dei forma, nisi in divinitatis plenitudine ? " Ambrosiaster, XVII, 408 : " Forma Dei nihil differt a Deo ".

Cf. also St. Athanasius, *Contra Arian,* orat. III, 5 ; XXVI, 332, St. Hilary: *De Trinit.* X, 22 ; X, 360, St. Basil, *Contra Eunom.* I, 18 ; XXIX, 552. For the above patristic references cf. Prat, o. c., vol. I[9], p. 535.

εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἀοράτου (Col. I, 15) [1]. The expression here is in reality a synonym for the Son. The Word is the image in so far as He proceeds from the Father, for it is of the essence to be a reproduction, a copy of its archetype [2]. The more perfect the image, the better it expresses its model [3], and one can imagine an image so perfect that it would be equal to the prototype. Such was the Son of God, in all things identical with the Father, differing from Him only by the fact of being engendered. The term itself, however, does not necessarily imply perfect representation. Thus man is said to be the image of God, εἰκὼν καὶ δόξα θεοῦ ὑπάρχων (I Cor. XI, 7). The idea of perfection does not lie in the word itself but must be sought from the context (e. q. πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα. v. 19, πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τῆς θεότητος, II, 8). The Son of God then is the image of the Father both because He is the Word, the Word by its nature expressing the intelligence which produces it and because He is Son, since generation tends to reproduce the generating principle.

Again, Christ is the " first-born of every creature ", πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως (Col. I, 15). This expression does not mean " first-born among creatures ", so that Christ would be regarded here as one, though the earliest, of created beings ; the Apostle does not write πρωτόκτιστος, but πρωτότοκος. Such a sense, moreover, would be inconsistent alike with the universal agency in creation which is ascribed to Him in the words following,

---

1. The term εἰκὼν was used of the Divine σοφία personified in Wisd. VII, 26. ἀπαύγασμα γὰρ ἐστι φωτὸς ἀϊδίου..... καὶ εἰκὼν τῆς ἀγαθότητος αὐτοῦ. Saint Paul himself applies the term to Our Lord in an earlier epistle, II Cor. IV,4 : τῆς δόξης τοῦ Χριστοῦ ὅς ἐστιν εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ (comp. III, 18 τὴν αὐτὴν εἰκόνα μεταμορφούμεθα). Closely allied to εἰκὼν in the same connexion is χαρακτήρ in Heb. I, 3 : ὢν ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης καὶ χαρακτὴρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ.

2. Cf. e. q. ST. GREG. NAZ. *Orat.* 30, 20 ; XXXVI, 129 : αὕτη γὰρ εἰκόνος φύσις μίμημα εἶναι τοῦ ἀρχετύπου. ST. JOHN DAM., *de imag.* I, 9 ; XCIV, 1240 : εἰκὼν ἐστιν ὁμοίωμα χαρακτηρίζον τὸ πρωτότυπον.

3. According to LEBRETON, *Les origines du dogme de la Trinité*[4], p. 365, the conception of the Son as image of God, when compared with the usage of the metaphor in Wisdom of Salomon (VII, 26), " recoit une nouvelle signification du fait de l'incarnation : le Fils en s'incarnant et en se manifestant aux hommes, leur révèle le Père ". Cf. Tit. II, 11, III, 4 ; John I, 18, XIV, 9. Cf. also LIGHTFOOT, *Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon*[5], p. 145. However, it is not the aptitude of the Son to reveal the Father which constitutes Him an " image ". He would be an image even if there were no reasonable creatures to receive His revelation, just as He would remain a Son if there were no one to receive adoptive filiation from Him.

ἐν αὐτῳ ἐκτίσθη τὰ πάντα, and with the absolute pre-existence and self-existence which is claimed for Him just below, αὐτὸς ἔστιν πρὸ πάντων[1]. The description, πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως, must be interpreted in such a way that it is not inconsistent with His other title of μονογενής, *unicus*, alone of His kind and therefore distinct from created things; the two words express the same eternal fact, but while μονογενής states it in itself, πρωτότοκος places it in relation to the Universe. In sum, that the Son be placed in the category of created beings, it would be necessary that He Himself were created or that creatures had been produced by way of generation; however, outside of Him nothing is engendered since He is the unique Son, and on the other hand He was not created Himself since all things were created by Him, and since a being consequently must be before it can operate. In fact the Apostle tells us that the Son is at once the efficient, the exemplary, and the final cause of all created things: ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ ἐκτίσθη τὰ πάντα... τὰ πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν ἔκτισται (Col. I, 16; cf. Rom. XI, 36; John I, 3). In the first place δι' αὐτοῦ all things, visible and invisible, in heaven and on earth, were created. Again, all things were created ἐν αὐτῷ: in Him, the perfect image of God, is found the idea and model of all

1. Some commentators translate πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως as " sovereign of the whole world ". In defense of this interpretation are quoted Ps. LXXXVIII 28; Heb. I, 2; Ex. IV, 22; Rom. VIII, 9; Job. XVIII, 13; Is. XIV, 30. But a closer examination of these passages will show that they do not justify this interpretation. Moreover, since the context forbids our including the πρωτότοκος among the κτίσις, the interpretation leaves the genitive inexplicable. In the composite πρωτότοκος, the first element is comparative (as in John I, 15: πρῶτος μου ἦν) and has reference to duration. Hence the only tenable interpretation is " begotten before πᾶσα κτίσις "; the ideas involved are priority in time and distinction from the genus κτίσις. Moreover, it may be questioned whether πάσης κτίσεως means " all creation " or " every creature " In favor of the latter rendering is the absence of the article after πᾶς If it be objected that κτίσις is one of those nouns which may dispense with the article such as γῆ (Lk. II, 14) οὐρανός (Acts III, 21), and κόσμος (Rom. V. 13), it is to be noted that this happens rarely and only in particular combinations. As an instance of κτίσις = the aggregate of created things being without the article, is cited Mk. XIII, 19, ἀπὸ ἀρχῆς κτίσεως, the parallel in Mt. XXIV, 21, having ἀπο ἀρχῆς κόσμου. But the point to be noticed is the anarthous use, not of κτίσις, but of the compound term ἀρχὴ κτίσεως, like ἀρχὴ κόσμου; ἀπ' ἀρχῆς being regularly used without the article, it is in accordance with rule that in ἀπὸ ἀρχῆς κτίσεως the latter word should also be anarthous. Moreover even κόσμος and γῆ do not dispense with the article when πᾶς precedes because of the ambiguity that would result. Cf. what we have said above concerning the Pauline usage of νόμος.

possible things ; in Him, as in their meeting-point, reside the laws and purposes which guide the creation and government of the Universe ; in Him, by " whom all things subsist " (Col. I, 17), is that principle of cohesion which impresses upon creation unity and solidarity, and makes it a cosmos instead of a chaos. Finally, all things are εἰς αὐτόν : all things must find their meeting-point, their reconciliation, at length in Him from whom they took their rise — in the Word as the mediatorial agent, and through the Word in the Father as the primary source (cf. Rom. VIII, 19 ; I Cor. VIII, 6, XV, 28 ; Eph. I, 10). Christ is thus not only the Alpha but also the Omega, not only the ἀρχή but also the τέλος, not only the first but also the last in the history of the Universe (cf. Heb. II, 10 ; Apoc. XXII, 13). The primacy of the divine Christ over creation is absolute[1].

The preexistent Christ not only played a supreme role in creation but He also anticipated, as it were, His work of the Redemption. For the Rock at which the Israelites drank and which accompanied them in the desert was Christ : ἔπινον γὰρ ἐκ πνευματικῆς ἀκολουθούσης πέτρας, ἡ πέτρα δὲ ἦν ὁ Χριστός (I Cor. X, 4). Christ was the Rock, not the rock of Horeb which Moses struck with a rod and which could not follow the Hebrews in their wanderings, but the true spiritual Rock which served as their refuge. From the moment of the miracle in Raphidim (Exod. XVII) up to the time when Moses was ordered in the desert Sin to speak to the rock (Num. XX), the *Verbum Incarnandum* miraculously supplied the Israelites with spiritual food and drink, the former a figure of the Eucharist bread, the latter of the chalice of benediction. The

1. It is to be noted that the expression πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως has nothing in common with πρωτότοκος ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν (Col. I, 18 ; cf. I Cor. XV, 20 : ἀπαρχὴ τῶν κεκοιμημένων, and Apoc. I, 5 : ὁ πρωτότοκος τῶν νεκρῶν ; cf. also I Cor. XV, 23). The glorious resurrection being a sort of a birth to a new life, Jesus Christ Who enters upon this new life before others is rightly called " the firstborn from the dead ". In a similar way Christ is called " the first-fruits of them that sleep " (I Cor. XV, 20). Our Lord is the exemplar and model according to which the just will rise ; the earth is as it were a vast field in which our bodies like seed are planted, and since the " firstfruits " have already appeared, we have hope that the harvest also will follow. Nor again is there any comparison to be made between πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως and the formula, πρωτότοκος ἐν πολλοῖς ἀδελφοῖς (Rom. VIII, 29). Sanctifying grace really confers upon us divine filiation, and thenceforth the Son deigns to receive us as brothers ; we participate with Him, though by analogy merely, the title of sons of God. But the relation of the Word to creatures is entirely different ; He is their " firtborn " because He precedes them in existence.

preexistent Christ then is here identified with Jehovah Who was the Rock (צור) of Israel (II Sam. XXIII, 3 ; Is. XXX, 29 ; II Sam. XXII, 32 ; Is. XLIV, 8 ; Dt. XXXII, 4), and Who accompanied His people across the desert. And should any doubt arise as to this identification of Christ with Jehovah, the Apostle himself removes it by adding : " Neither let us tempt Christ, as some of them tempted, and perished by the serpents " (I Cor. X, 9). The Rock of Israel, Jehovah, whom the Israelites tempted, was Christ.

Finally, Saint Paul tells us that at a certain moment of time Christ came into this world, Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς ἦλθεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἁμαρτωλοὺς σῶσαι (I Tim. I, 15). He appeared in the flesh, ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί (I Tim. III, 16). Though He was " rich " and Lord of all things, He became poor, and had not even where to lay his head (cf. Mt. VIII, 20) ; the reason of this humiliation was His will to procure spiritual blessings for us, δι' ὑμᾶς ἐπτώχευσεν πλούσιος ὤν (II Cor. VIII, 9 ; cf. Phil. II, 5 ff.). The exchange of heavenly riches for earthly poverty necessarily presupposes a mode of existence prior to the Incarnation. Again, the Apostle says that the mission of the Son coincides with His terrestrial origin, that the " likeness of sinful flesh " is the term of this mission : " God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh and of sin, hath condemned sin in the flesh " (Rom. VIII, 3), and again, " God sent his Son, made of a woman, made under the law, that he might redeem them who were under the law. that we might receive the adoption of sons " (Gal. IV, 4, 5). Hence His preexistence necessarily preceded.

The nature of Jesus Christ is further revealed by the Apostle's placing of *Christ* in the same category as the *Father*. In the salutations and exordia of almost all the Epistles the Father and Son are associated as equals : " Grace to you, and peace from God our Father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ " (Rom. I, 7 ; I Cor. I, 3 ; II Cor. I, 2 ; Gal. I, 3 ; Eph. I, 2 ; Phil. I, 2 ; Philem. I, 3 ; cf. also II Thess. I, 2 ; I Tim. I, 2 ; II Tim. I, 2 ; Tit. I, 4)[1]. In the course of his Epistles the Apostle frequently invokes God the Father and Jesus Christ, prays to both at once,

1. The Fathers frequently appealed to this formula to prove against the Arians the equality of the Father and the Son. ST. ATHANASIUS, *c. Arian. Or.* 3, 11, 13; ST. CYR. ALEX., *Thesaur. de Trin. Ass.* 12. Cf. CORNELY, *Epistola ad Romanos*, p. 52.

or calls upon them as witnesses (I Thess. III, 11 ; II Thess. II, 16 ; I Tim. VI, 13 ; II Tim. IV, 1). Again, the Father and Christ are frequently united, not as the source of grace or as the object of prayer, but as the spiritual atmosphere in which the Church lives : " Paul and Sylvanus and Timothy to the church of the Thessalonians in God the Father and in the Lord Jesus Christ " (I Thess. I, 1 ; II Thess. I, 1). The same idea is expressed in the formulas so characteristic of Saint Paul, " in God " and " in Christ Jesus ". Again, when the Apostle says of himself that he is neither a mandatory nor a delegate of men but calls himself an Apostle exclusively of Jesus Christ and of God the Father, he evidently, considers Christ as wholly superior to man : Παῦλος ἀπόστολος οὐκ ἀπ' ἀνθρώπων οὐδὲ δι' ἀνθρώπου ἀλλὰ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ θεοῦ πατρὸς Gal. I, 1) ; this statement is all the more remarkable when we remember that Saint Paul would not derive grace — and especially a grace such as the Apostolate — from any being inferior to God,and when we notice that he here places both Jesus Christ and God the Father under the same causative particle διὰ, without establishing between the two a subordination of rank or authority.

But though the Apostle often demands grace also of Christ alone (Rom. XVI, 20 ; I Cor. XVI, 23 ; Gal. VI, 18 ; Phil. IV, 23 ; I Thess. V, 28 ; II Thess. III, 18), and addresses to Him doxologies which are reserved only to God (II Tim. IV, 18 ; cf. II Peter III, 18 ; Apoc. I, 6), nevertheless, the anxiety perhaps of not even apparently compromising the rigor of Hebrew monotheism leads him to establish between the Father and the Son, whenever he mentions them conjointly, an order which he never inverts. " All things are yours ", he tells the Corinthians, " and you are Christ's, and Christ is God's " (I Cor. III, 22, 23). The Corinthians must not glory in men because the latter are Christ's ministers (I Cor. III, 5, IV, 1) and through Christ the servants of the faithful (II Cor. IV, 5), nor in the things given them (I Cor. III, 22) because these are intended as a means to salvation, nor finally in themselves because whatever they have they have received from God ; but all things must be referred and attributed to Him by and through Whom are all things : " by one Lord Jesus Christ are all things, and we by him " (I Cor. VIII, 6) ; by the Word all things were made (John I, 3; Col. I, 16 ff.), and by the Word made flesh we were

all redeemed with a great price (I Cor. VI, 6, VII, 23) ; we must therefore glory only in Christ and through Him in God because Christ Himself is God's according to both His divine and His human nature, according to the former because the Word proceeds from the Father, according to the latter because His human nature was created by God.

The Apostle establishes a similar order when he makes known to the Corinthians the principle governing the hierarchical organization of the Church : παντὸς ἀνδρὸς ἡ κεφαλὴ ὁ Χριστός ἐστιν, κεφαλὴ δὲ γυναικὸς ὁ ἀνήρ, κεφαλὴ δὲ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ὁ θεός (I Cor. XI, 3). Though in their interior life of grace both man and woman are united to Christ, the Head of the Church, in the same way, in the external life of the Church the order is different : here the woman is enjoined neither to speak nor to teach but to be subject to the man as to her head ; on the other hand, the man who is chosen to govern the Church depends immediately on Christ, and is men's head not *per se* but as Christ's minister and vicar ; finally, the head of Christ is God from Whom Christ received all power in heaven and on earth (Mt. XXVIII, 18), and to Whom after having overcome all enemies He will deliver the kingdom (I Cor. XV, 24).

The complete dependence of all things on Christ, and of Christ on God will be consummated on the last day : " Afterwards the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God and the Father, when he shall have brought to nought all principality, and power, and virtue. For he must reign until he hath put all his enemies under his feet. And the enemy death shall be destroyed last... And when all things shall be subdued unto him, then the Son also himself shall be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all " (I Cor. XV, 24-28). When Christ shall have finally overcome death and all His enemies, when the Church militant shall have come to an end, and when He shall have given up the kingdom to the Father, Christ will no longer be subject to the Father as *Rex Ecclesiae militantis* but as *Rex Ecclesiae glorificatae et jam ad perfectionem adductae.*

Again, the *Son* is frequently mentioned together with the *Father* and the *Holy Spirit,* and, while there is no fixed order in the enumeration, the three Persons are distinguished from every creature and placed in the category of Divine Being. Thus the Apostle attributes to the Son alone the grace which

elsewhere he attributes to both the Father and the Son, and says that its primary source is the love of the Father and its effective distributor the Holy Ghost : " The grace of our *Lord Jesus Christ*, and the charity of *God*, and the communication of the *Holy Ghost* be with you all " (II Cor. XIII, 13). Saint Paul here begins with the Second Person, Who, by taking upon Himself our nature and by satisfying for us by His Death, is the Author of all grace by which we are justified and sanctified ; but the quasi-ultimate fountain of this grace is the love of the Father Who so loved the world that He gave His only-begotten Son that everyone who believeth in Him might have life eternal ; all graces, however, are communicated to us by the Holy Ghost Who is the distributor both of graces *gratum facientium* (Gal. V, 22) and of graces *gratis datarum* (I Cor. XII, 4) [1]. In I Cor. XII, 4-6 we again read : " Now there are diversities of graces, but the same *Spirit ;* and there are diversities of ministries, but the same *Lord ;* and there are diversities of operations, but the same *God*, who worketh all in all ". The fact that in this last verse the order of enumeration is changed shows that the Apostle did not conceive any essential inequality between the three Persons.

At other times the Three Persons are mentioned together in connection with their eternal relations and missions which they receive from one another. Thus the Apostle tells us that it is God the Father Who sends the Spirit Who is at the same time the Spirit of the Son and therefore sent by Him also, that we owe our adoptive filiation to the Holy Spirit, to the Son, and to the Father, and that the presence of the Holy Spirit supposes adoptive filiation with all its rights : " When the fulness of the time was come, God sent his Son, made of a woman, made under the law, that he might redeem them who were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons. And because you are sons, God hath sent the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying : Abba, Father (Gal. IV, 4-6) ; " For whosoever are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God. For you have not received the spirit of bondage again in fear ;

1. We understand the genitive in the third member, " communication of the Holy Ghost ", in the same way as in the other two, namely, as a subjective genitive. An objective genitive, however, an explanation usually proposed by the Greek Fathers, is equally tenable; in that case the κοινωνία τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος would be its participation and reception whereby we are sanctified.

but you have received the spirit of adoption of sons, whereby we cry : Abba (Father). For the Spirit himself giveth testimony to our spirit, that we are the sons of God. And if sons, heirs also ; heirs indeed of God, and joint heirs with Christ " (Rom. VIII, 14-17).

Again, the Apostle says that our baptismal regeneration is due to the Father Who, without any regard to our merits which we neither possessed nor were capable of acquiring, had mercy on us, it is due also to Jesus Christ Who is our Saviour and Mediator, and finally, it is due to the Holy Spirit, the common Envoy of the Father and of the Son, our Sanctifier, Who is liberally poured out upon us : " But when the goodness and kindness of *God* our Saviour appeared, not by the works of justice, which we have done, but according to his mercy, he saved us, by the laver of regeneration, and renovation of the *Holy Ghost,* whom he hath poured forth upon us abundantly, through *Jesus Christ* our Saviour " (Tit. III, 4-6 ; cf. Cor. VI, 11). The Three Persons also appear together in the conferring and in the exercise of the apostolate : the Father is the first author of the spiritual gifts of the apostolic preachers, the Son the source of their supernatural life, the Spirit the seal of their mission and pledge of their success : " Now he that confirmeth us with you in *Christ,* and that hath anointed us, is *God,* who also hath sealed us, and given the pledge of the *Spirit* in our hearts " (II Cor. I, 21-22). Again, the Apostle, considering himself as exercising a certain priesthood in regard to the Gentiles and as assisting the unique High-Priest of the New Alliance, represents the Gentiles as victims to be offered up by their mystic death with the Victim of Calvary ; it is the Father Who receives the sacrifice, Jesus Christ Who by the ministry of Paul presents it, and the Holy Ghost Who sanctifies and consecrates it : " because of the grace which is given me from God, that I should be the minister of *Christ Jesus* among the Gentiles ; sanctifying the gospel of *God,* that the oblation of the Gentiles may be made acceptable and sanctified in the *Holy Ghost* " (Rom. XV, 15-16). Hence we see Christ constantly mentioned with the Father and the Holy Spirit, and like the former enjoying the same divine dignity [1].

1. In this connection we did not adduce the following texts either because exegetes are not agreed as to their interpretation, or because the *rapprochement* of the Three Persons is not simultaneous :

And when the eyes of Saint Paul rest on the Son alone, when he considers Him especially as the Redeemer and as the Mediator of grace, the prerogatives, titles, and role which he attributes to Him are inexplicable save on the supposition of Christ's divinity ; this truth, in fact, lies at the basis of the Apostle's whole doctrine which is, as it were, impregnated by it and which would be unintelligible without it. As long as man is not united to the Son, says Saint Paul, he is χωρὶς Χριστοῦ, is by that very fact ἄθεος and an enemy of God (Rom. v, 10 ; Eph. II, 12-18). Formerly the Gentiles were " without Christ, having no hope of the promise, and without God in this world " (Eph. II, 12), " alienated and enemies in mind in evil works " (Col. I, 21), and in need of the glory of God (Rom. III, 23). But now they are " justified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus " (Rom. III, 24), in Whom those " who some time were afar off, are made nigh in his blood " (Eph. II, 13), and " presented holy and unspotted before him " (Col. I, 22). Henceforth the approach to God is very easy, and he who only recently was an enemy of God becomes a son as soon as he is incorporated into Christ by baptism (Gal. III, 26-27 ; Rom. VI, 3-11). In baptism we die to the " old man " and rise with Christ ; henceforth the past is effaced, we no longer have anything of which we can glory because " Jesus Christ is made unto us of God wisdom, and justice, and sanctification, and redemption : that as it is

---

a) Rom. XIV, 17-18 : " For the kingdom of *God* is not meat and drink; but justice, and peace, and joy in the *Holy Ghost*. For he that in this serveth *Christ*, pleaseth *God*.

b) I Cor. XII, 3 : " No man speaking by the *Spirit of God*, saith anathema to *Jesus*. And no man can say, the *Lord Jesus*, but by the *Holy Ghost* ".

c) II Cor. III, 3 : " You are the epistle of *Christ*, ministered by us, and written not with ink, but with the *Spirit of the living God* ".

d) Eph. II, 18 : " For by him *(Christ)* we have access both in one *Spirit* to the *Father*.

e) Eph. II, 22 : " In whom (the *Lord)* you also are built together into an habitation of *God* in the *Spirit*.

f) I Thess. V, 18-19 : " In all things give thanks ; for this is the will of *God* in *Christ Jesus* concerning you. Extinguish not the *spirit*.

g) II Thess. II, 13-14 : " But we ought to give thanks to *God* always for you, brethren, beloved of *God*, for that *God* hath chosen you firstfruits unto salvation, in sanctification of the *spirit*, and faith of the truth : whereunto also he hath called you by our gospel, unto the purchasing of the glory of *our Lord Jesus Christ* ".

h) Cf. also Rom. XI, 36, V, 1-5 ; I Cor. VI, 15-20 ; Gal. III, 11-14 ; Col. I, 6-8 ; Eph. III, 14-17, IV, 4-6, V, 18-20.

written : he that glorieth may glory in the Lord " (I Cor. I, 30, 31 ; cf. Gal. III, 28 ; Col. III, 9-11 ; Phil. III, 4-8). By baptism (I Cor. XII, 13) " we being many are one body in Christ, and every one members one of another " (Rom. XII, 5) ; by partaking of the Eucharist, " we being many are one bread, one body " (I Cor. X, 17). The sole life-principle of this body is the Head, i. e., Christ from Whom " the whole body, by joints and bands, being supplied with nourishment and compacted, groweth unto the increase of God " (Col. II, 19). From Him proceed the various graces by means of which members complete one another, and cooperate in the life and growth of the body (Eph. IV, 11-16 ; cf. Acts IV, 12 ; John XV, 1). Saint Paul himself frequently tells us that Christ is the source and center of his life, and that he is continually drawn towards Him into heaven (Gal. II, 19-20 ; Phil. I, 23-24 ; II Cor. V, 6-8 ; I Thess. IV, 17, V, 9-10). Jesus is not only the ideal Man Whom the Apostle desires to imitate, not merely the Friend Whom he impatiently wishes to rejoin, but the Source of his life, the Chief of Whom he is a member [1].

The above ideas are at the basis of the Apostle's doctrinal exposition both in his Epistle to the Galatians and in his Epistle to the Romans. In the former the Apostle categorically rejects the Mosaic religion with its sabbaths, its religious

1. The Apostle, we might note, does not separate the role of Christ in the Church from His role in the world ; everywhere Christ is the first, the center, the principle of life. Furthermore, it was not only man who fell by original sin but the " creature itself groaneth and travaileth in pain, even till now, to be delivered from the servitude of corruption, into the liberty of the glory of the children of God " (Rom. VIII, 22, 21). Hence the Apostle also writes that " through him it hath well pleased the Father to reconcile all things unto himself, making peace through the blood of his cross, both as to the things that are on earth, and the things that are in heaven " (Col. I, 20). This intimate union of man and the world enables us to understand how Saint Paul so easily passes from the conception of Christ as Head of the Church to that of Christ as Creator and Conserver of the world. True, the two relations are not equivalent ; the Christians are " created in Christ Jesus " (Eph. II, 10) in an altogether different manner than the world was " created in him " (Col. I, 16) ; they are sons of God, a privilege, which they derive from their " fellowship of his Son Jesus Christ our Lord " (I Cor. I, 9), and belong to the household of God (Eph. II, 20) ; far from being confounded with creatures, they can say that " all things are theirs, and they are Christ's, and Christ is God's " (I Cor. III, 22-23). Nevertheless, it is because all creatures subsist, live, and have their being in Christ, that this organic hierarchy is intelligible and that Christians, members of Christ, participate in His lordship over all things.

feasts, its observances and circumcision (Gal. IV, 9, 10). The Law was our pedagogue unto Christ, and once it had fulfilled this office it lost its *raison d'être*. Redemption, sanctification, and adoptive filiation, blessings, which the Law was powerless to confer, are to be found in Christ alone. To participate in these privileges one thing alone is required, namely, faith in Jesus Christ. By faith the soul is transformed, regenerated, and renewed, is animated by the Spirit of Christ, and lives a new life. Here again, is it not evident that faith in the divinity of Jesus is at the foundation of the Apostle's teaching? If for Saint Paul Jesus had not been God-man, if He had been merely and solely man, no faith, however intense, ardent, and absolute it might be, would have had, in the Apostle's estimation, the power of transforming the human soul and of making it rise from the degrading chains of Sin to the liberty and summits of Christian perfection [1].

In his Epistle to the Romans, after having described the universal prevalence of sin and the helplessness of natural man to arrive by his own powers at justice, the Apostle tells us that God gave us His own Son in order that He might do for us what the Law was intended but because of the flesh was unable to accomplish (Rom. VIII, 32, 2). It is through Him that we have redemption, it is by faith in Him that there is produced in us a metamorphosis, a new creation, a divine nature endowed with new properties. Now if Saint Paul attributes all these marvellous effects to faith in Jesus Christ, is it not because he believed in Christ's divinity ? Could he have ever even thought that faith in Christ as mere man would engender such effects, and make of fallen man a new being ?

Moreover, after having described in the same Epistle these

1. This intimate connection between Christology and soteriology is brought out explicitly in Colossians where the Apostle says that He " in whom we have redemption through his blood, the remission of sins " (I 14), He, through whom it hath well pleased the Father to reconcile all things unto himself, making peace through the blood of his cross, both as to the things that are on earth, and the things that are in heaven " (I, 20), He, " who blotted out the handwriting of the decree that was against us, and hath taken the same out of the way, fastening it to the cross " (II, 14), and " who " despoiled the principalities and powers, exposing them in open show and triumphing over them in himself " (II, 15), is at the same time " the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of every creature " (I, 15), " in whom dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead corporeally " (II, 9), and God's beloved Son (I, 13).

wonderful fruits of justification by faith, he suddenly turns to his brethren according to the flesh ; after having expressed his great sorrow and continual sadness because of their infidelity, he enumerates the prerogatives with which God favored Israel, the most glorious of which is that " of them is Christ, according to the flesh, who is over all things, God blessed for ever ", ἐξ ὧν ὁ Χριστὸς τὸ κατὰ σάρκα, ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων θεὸς εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας (Rom. IX, 5). [1]. This much-discussed text may be punctuated in three ways : by placing a comma after σάρκα and referring the whole passage to Christ, by placing a full stop after σάρκα and translating " He who is God over all be blessed for ever ", or by placing a comma after σάρκα and a full stop at πάντων : " who is over all. God be (or is) blessed for ever ". The first interpretation gives us a clear and explicit profession of faith in the divinity of Christ, the other two a doxology in honor of the Father. If the mere exigencies of grammar be considered, the three interpretations are all equally possible [2]. Nor can it be shown, strictly speaking, that a doxology in honor of the Father could not stand here ; nevertheless, it is also true that such a doxology in the present case would certainly be unnatural and out of place. First of all, the expression, τὸ κατὰ σάρκα, leads us to expect such an antithesis as we find in ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων Θεός [3]. The same terms,

1. For Rom. IX, 5, cf. PRAT, o. c., vol. II[6], pp. 150-152, DURAND, art, *La divinité de Jésus Christ dans s. Paul*, RB, 1903, pp. 550-570, LAGRANGE. *Épître aux Romains*, p. 227, LEBRETON, *Les origines du dogme de la Trinité*[4], p. 381, SANDAY, *Epistle to the Romans*[5], pp. 233-238. STRÖMMAN, art. *Rom.* IX, 5, ZNTW, 1907, p. 319 ff., arbitrarily proposes the following reading of Rom. IX, 5 : ὧν οἱ πατέρες, καὶ ἐξ ὧν ὁ Χριστὸς τὸ κατὰ σάρκα, ὧν (nämlich τῶν Ἰσραηλειτῶν) ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων θεὸς (oder ὧν ἐπὶ πάντων ὁ θεὸς), εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, ἀμήν.

2. The evidence of the uncial MSS does not help us very much in the present case. Of these ℵ has no punctuation. A puts a point after σάρκα and leaves a slight space ; but this does not oblige us to conclude that the scribe did not apply to Christ what follows, since there is a similar point and space between Χριστοῦ and ὑπὲρ in v. 3, a point between σάρκα and οἵτινες, and another between Ἰσραηλῖται and ὧν, members of a phrase, which the sense undoubtedly unites. B has a colon after σάρκα and a space at the end of the verse, while C has a pause after σάρκα. But the punctuation of the MSS, apart from its interest in the history of interpretation, has no other value or authority save that of a private interpretation. Our present MSS, which begin in the fourth century, do not represent an early tradition ; if there were any traditional punctuation we should have to seek it rather in early versions and in the Fathers of the second and third century.

3. In Rom. IV, 1, however, κατὰ σάρκα is not followed by an expressed antithesis. It is also objected that the proper antithesis to σάρξ is πνεῦμα.

τὸ κατὰ σάρκα, also suggest a parallel with Rom. I, 3, 4 : as there Saint Paul describes the human descent from David, but expressly limits it κατὰ σάρκα, and then in contrast describes His divine descent κατά πνεῦμα ἁγιωσύνης, so too here, having been led by this argument to stress the human birth of Christ as a Jew, the Apostle would naturally correct a one-sided statement by pointing to Christ's divine nature. Saint Paul, in fact, is here enumerating the privileges of Israel, and as the highest and last privilege, he reminds his readers that it was from this Jewish stock after all that Christ in his human nature had come ; then, in order to emphasize this, he dwells on the exalted divine character of Him who came according to the flesh as the Jewish Messias. The Apostle would thus enhance the privileges of his countrymen, and put a culminating point to his argument. On the contrary, the sudden introduction of a doxology in honor of the Father would not only be very awkward but also inconsistent with the tone of sadness which pervades the passage[1]. It is quite true of course that Saint Paul was full of gratitude for the privileges of his race and especially for the coming of the Messias ; but that is not the thought in his mind here ; his feeling is one of sadness and failure. Nor is such an interpretation supported by Rom. I, 25, which, like II Cor. XI, 31, is only an instance of the ordinary Jewish usage of adding an ascription of praise when the name of God has been introduced. That, however, would not apply in the present case where there is no previous mention of the name of God.

Does Pauline usage, however, forbid us to refer to Christ such expressions as θεός and ἐπὶ πάντων, or to address a doxology to Him ? We do not think so. Thus the fact that Saint Paul considers Christ as being at the head of creation (Col. I, 15 ff.) quite justifies the use of the expression ἐπὶ πάντων of Him. So too, when Saint Paul speaks of Christ as εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ (II Cor. IV, 4 ; Col. I, 15), as ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων and ἴσα θεῷ (Phil. II, 6), he ascribes to Him no lesser dignity than

---

But this objection is invalid. Θεός is used in several uses in contrast to σάρξ. Cf. Lk. III, 6 ; I Cor. I, 29 ; Col. III, 29 ; Philem. 16 ; Jer. XVII, 5 ; Dan. II, 11.

1. The doxologies of Saint Paul are usually related to what precedes. Cf. ὅς ἐστιν (Rom. I, 25), ὁ ὢν (II Cor. XI, 31), ᾧ (Gal. I, 5 ; II Tim. IV, 18 ; cf. I Pet. IV, 11 ; Heb. XIII, 21), αὐτῷ (Rom. XI, 36; Eph. III, 21 ; cf. I Pet. V, 11 ; II Pet. III, 18), τῷ δὲ θεῷ (Phil. IV, 20 ; I Tim. I, 17).

would be implied by θεός as predicate. Again in Tit. II, 13-14 the Apostle says : προσδεχόμενοι τὴν μακαρίαν ἐλπίδα καὶ ἐπιφάνειαν τῆς δόξης τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ ; that in this text the title θεός is attributed to Christ is evident from the following : if it referred to the Father the qualification μεγάλου would be superfluous, secondly, the ἐπιφάνεια is always the glorious manifestation of the Son, and, finally, the two titles, θεοῦ and σωτῆρος, are in the Greek both governed by the same definite article and are therefore to be attributed to the same person. Elsewhere the Apostle says : " in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead corporeally " (Col. II, 9) i. e., the divine nature itself dwells in the body of Christ. Nor is there anything in Saint Paul's Epistles to forbid us ascribing εὐλογητὸς to Christ (cf. II Tim. IV, 18 ; II Thess. I, 2 ; Phil. II, 5-8). [1]. Finally, any doubt that might remain as to the interpretation of Rom. IX, 5, is dispelled by the testimony of the early Fathers of both the East and the West, by that of the Greek commentators who, we think, knew their own language a little better than the moderns, all of whom, without being influenced by controversy or dogmatic prejudice, entertained no doubt as to the precise reference of the passage but unhesitatingly attributed the doxology to Christ [2].

---

1. It is also to be noted that if the passage in question were an ascription of blessing to the Father the word εὐλογητός would naturally come first, just as the word " Blessed " would in English. An examination of the LXX and of Semitic inscriptions shows that this is almost invariably its position. This rule could only be broken, if there were need of stressing some particular word. Cf. PRAT, o. c., vol. II[6], p. 145.

2. From the *second century* we have the testimony of IRENAEUS, *Contr. haer.* III, XVI, 3 ; MIGNE, VII, 922.

From the *third century* : TERTULLIAN, *Adv. Prax.*, XIII and XV ; MIGNE, II, 170, 173, HIPPOLYTUS, *c. haeres. Noeti*, VI ; X, 812, ORIGEN, in h. l. (trans. Ruf.), XIV, 1140, NOVATIAN, *De Trinit.*, XIII ; III, 908, CYPRIAN, *Testim.*, II, 6 ; IV, 702, DENYS OF ALEXANDRIA, *Epist. Dion. contra Paul. Samos.*, resp. 6 ; LABBE, *Concil.*, I, 892.

From the *fourth century* : ATHANASIUS, Orat. I, *c. Arian.*, II ; XXVI, 33, Orat. IV, *c. Arian.*, I ; XXVI, 468, *Ad Serap. epist.*, II, 2 ; XXVI, 609, *Ad Epict. epist.* 10 ; XXVI, 1065, *Disput. c. Arium*, 20 and 21 ; XXVIII, 461, HILARIUS, *De Trin.*, VIII, 37 ; X, 264, BASIL, *c. Eunom.*, IV ; XXIX, 677, GREGORY OF NYSSA, *c. Eunom.*, XII ; XLV, 861.

From the years 370-420 : EPIPHANIUS, *Adv. haer.*, II ; XLI, 1008, JOHN CHRYSOSTOM, LX, 552, LXI, 164, XLVIII, 739, JOHN DAMASCENE, XCV, 632, AMBROSE, *De Spir. S.*, I, III, 46 ; XVI, 715, AMBROSIASTER, XVII, 132, XXXV, 2284, JEROME, *Epist.* CXXI, IX ; XXII, 1029, AUGUSTIN, XLII, 860,

Another title which Saint Paul attributes to Christ and which is equivalent to that of *God* is *Lord*, κύριος. In the LXX, as we know, κύριος is the Greek equivalent of *Jehovah;* among the Jews the sacred Tetragrammaton יהוה might not be uttered, and whenever it occured in Sacred Scripture it was read *Adonai* (Lord). In the Epistles Jesus is commonly called " Lord " ; He is " the Lord Jesus Christ " or " the Lord Jesus " ; " Lord " has become so much the proper name for Christ that it can omit the article (cf. Rom. XIV, 16 ; I Cor. VII, 22 ; Eph. VI, 8 ; Phil. II, 11) ; and the words, " Our Lord, Jesus Christ, Son of God ", contain a resumé of the Apostle's Christology (Rom. I, 4 ; I Cor. I, 9). In fact, for Saint Paul the formula, " Christ is Lord ", is, as it were an *abrégé* of his gospel : " we preach not ourselves, but Jesus Christ our Lord " (II Cor. IV, 5) ; it is a profession of faith containing in substance the conditions of salvation : " if thou confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and believe in thy heart that God hath raised him up from the dead, thou shalt be saved " (Rom. X, 9 ; cf. Is. XXVIII, 16) ; it is the test title, dividing between believers and those outside : " no man speaking by the Spirit of God, saith Anathema to Jesus. And no man can say, the Lord Jesus, but by the Holy Ghost " (I Cor. XII, 3). On the other hand, Lord stands for God only in Old Testament quotations ; this fact, however, is not without significance, for it is hardly possible that the application of the name to Christ could be without reference to this use of it or without the writers being conscious of its connotation in the understanding of the Jewish mind (cf. I Cor. X, 4, 9).

In fact, Pauline usage clearly shows that the Apostle identified the names of God and of Lord. Thus Saint Paul says : " be you filled with the holy Spirit, speaking to yourselves in psalms, and hymns, and spiritual canticles, singing and making melody in your hearts to the *Lord* " (Eph. V, 18-19) ; in a parallel passage, however, Lord is replaced by God : " teach and admonish one another in psalms, hymns, and spiritual canticles, singing in grace in your hearts to *God* " (Col. III, 16). Hence the faithful addressed the same praises to God and to the Lord. Again the Apostle writes : " Who

XXXV, 2078. The first one to ascribe the doxology to the Father was PHOTIUS, *c. Manich*, III, XIV ; CII, 157. For a more detailed discussion of the above references cf. DURAND, art. c., RB, 1903, pp. 550-570.

hath known the mind of the *Lord* " (Rom. XI, 34) ? and later on, " but we have the mind of *Christ* " (I Cor. II, 16). Hence the mind of Christ is the mind of the Lord. The sequence of the argument in Rom. XIV is likewise noteworthy : " He that eateth, eateth to the *Lord* " (v. 6) ; here the " Lord " is *God*. But presently : " whether we live, or whether we die, we are the Lord's. For to this end *Christ* died and rose again, that he might be *Lord* both of the dead and of the living " (vv. 8, 9) ; here the " Lord " is Christ. And finally, " For we shall all stand before the judgment seat of *Christ*. For it is written : As I live, saith the *Lord*, every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue shall confess to *God* " (v. 10, 11 ; cf. II Cor. V, 10). It would seem that Christ is not only the Lord but also God, so that in v. 6 where the Lord is God He may still be Christ. Again, Saint Paul writes to Timothy : " the *Lord* stood by me and empowered (ενεδυνάμωσε) me " (II Tim. IV, 17), while in Phil. IV, 13 it was, " I can do all things through *Christ* who empowereth (ἐνδυναμοῦντι) me ", and in II Cor. XII, 9, " I will glory in my infirmities that the power (δύναμις) of *Christ* may rest upon me ". The Ephesians are similarly exhorted to " be strengthened (ἐνδυναμοῦσθε) in the *Lord*, and in the might of his power, and to put on the armour of *God* " (Eph. VI, 10, 11). The above examples suffice, we think, to show that in the Pauline Epistles the terms " Christ ", " Lord ", and " God " are interchangeable.

Joel (III, 5) speaking of Jehovah says : אֲשֶׁר־יִקְרָא בְּשֵׁם יְהוָה יִמָּלֵט ; but the Lord according to Saint Paul is Christ : " For there is no distinction of the Jew and the Greek ; for the same is Lord over all, rich unto all that call upon him. For whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord, shall be saved " (Rom. X, 12, 13). Jesus is the κύριος πάντων (Acts X, 36) ; the faithful invoke Him as the Israelites invoked God (I Cor. I, 2) ; they are the ἐπικαλουμένοι τὸ ὄνομα τούτο (Acts IX, 14, 21) ; Christ is the εὐλογητὸς θεός (Rom. IX, 5), whose " unsearchable riches " Paul is announcing to the Gentiles (Eph. III, 8). Salvation which formerly was attributed to the invocation of Jehovah is now attributed to that of Christ. Saint Paul himself illustrates by his own practice what he preaches ; feeling in his flesh " a sting, an angel of Satan ", who buffets him and seems to paralyze his ministry, he thrice beseechs the Lord to be delivered from it. And the Lord said to him : " My grace

is sufficient for thee " (II Cor. XII, 9). The Apostle does not invoke God the Father, but the Lord, because he knows that to pray to the Lord is to pray to God Himself ; and the Lord, the author and distributor of grace, promises him His all-powerful aid.

As Lord Christ is Master of all : " none of us liveth to himself, and no man dieth to himself. For whether we live, we live unto the Lord ; or whether we die, we die unto the Lord. Therefore, whether we live, or whether we die, we are the Lord's. For to this end Christ died and rose again, that he might be Lord both of the dead and of the living (Rom. XIV, 7-9) ; in fact, we are, as Saint Paul often says, " slaves " of the Lord (Rom. I, 1 ; I Cor. VII, 22 ; Gal. I, 10 ; Eph. VI, 6 ; Phil. I, 1 ; Col. IV, 12). Formerly we were " servants " of sin (cf. Rom. VI, 14 : Ἁμαρτία γὰρ ὑμῶν οὐ κυριεύσει ; 17 : ὅτι ἦτε δοῦλοι τῆς ἁμαρτίας ; 20 : ὅτε γὰρ δοῦλοι ἦτε τῆς ἁμαρτίας), of death (Rom. V, 14 : ἐβασίλευσεν ὁ θάνατος), and of the Law (Rom. VII, 1 : Ὁ νόμος κυριεύει τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐφ' ὅσον χρόνον ζῇ ; cf. Gal. III, 13, IV, 4-5). But Christ redeemed us from this servitude and bondage, and made us His own : " You are not your own, for you are bought with a great price " (I Cor. VI, 19, 20) ; " he that is called in the Lord, being a bondman, is the freeman of the Lord. Likewise he that is called, being free, is the bondman of Christ. You are bought with a price ; be not made the bondslaves of men " (I Cor. VII, 22, 23).

As Lord, Christ is also the supreme and universal Judge. It is He Who will " bring to light the hidden things of darkness and will make manifest the counsels of the hearts " (I Cor. IV, 5). It is as Judge that the Apostle represents Him when he speaks of the ἡμέρα τοῦ κυρίου (I Cor. IV, 5, V, 5 ; II Cor. I, 14 ; I Thess. V, 2 ; II Thess. II, 2), παρουσία τοῦ κυρίου (I Thess. II, 19, III, 13, V, 23 ; II Thess. II, 1), and ἐπιφανεία τοῦ κυρίου (I Tim. VI, 14).

We have briefly summarized above the Pauline testimonies concerning the divinity of Christ. We have seen the Apostle describing Christ as God's pre-existent Son, as equal to the Father, and as the Lord God. But although Saint Paul insists so much upon Christ's divine nature, he affirms with no less emphasis that Jesus Christ was also man, like unto other men except sin. In fact, Saint Paul often, without any regard for chronological order, speaks at once of Christ's preexistence,

historical existence, and glorification, and attributes them to the same subject (cf. Rom. I, 3-4 ; II Cor. VIII, 9 ; Phil. II, 6, 7, 9; Col. I, 16, 18 ; Col. II, 9-10) ; since certain attributes are incompatible with His human and others with His divine nature, and since the subject of attribution remains the same, there must needs be in Christ two natures but only one person. Furthermore, since in the actual order the Fall and the Redemption take place according to the law of solidarity, since Christ in order to fulfil His mission must be " Second Adam " (Rom. V, 12-19 ; I Cor. XV, 22) and " first-born from the dead " (Col. I, 18), it was necessary that the Son of God become son of man in order that men might become sons of God.

Art. III. — JESUS CHRIST MAN.

Saint Paul nowhere tells us how the union of the divine and human natures in Christ took place but merely gives us two brief formulas for the Incarnation. In Col. II, 9 the Apostle tells us that the divine nature itself become incarnate has its fixed abode in Christ : " in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead corporeally ", ἐν αὐτῷ κατοικεῖ πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τῆς θεότητος σωματικῶς [1]. The other text where we read of the

1. The verb κατοικεῖ implies permanent residence or fixed abode. The false teachers probably maintained only a partial or transient connexion of the πλήρωμα with Christ. Hence Saint Paul maintains that it is not a παροικία but a κατοικία. The two words κατοικεῖν and παροικεῖν occur in the LXX as the common rendering of יָשַׁב and גּוּר respectively ; the former denotes permanence, the latter transitoriness. Cf. Gen. XXXVI, 44 (XXXVII, 1): κατῴκει δὲ Ἰακὼβ ἐν τῇ γῇ οὗ παρῴκησεν ὁ πατὴρ αὐτοῦ ἐν γῇ Χαναάν. Cf. also Osea X, 5 ; Philo, *Sacr. Ab. et Ca.* 10.

The term πλήρωμα is one of the substantives in — μα, which are formed from the perfect passive, and always seem to have a passive sense. As πληροῦν is " to complete " so πλήρωμα is " that which is completed ", i. e., plenitude, perfection. Cf. Lightfoot, *Epistle to the Colossians*[6], p. 257 ff.

As to the term θεότητος, it is to be remarked that θεότης, the abstract of θεός, must not be confused with θειότης (cf. Rom. I, 20 ; Wisd. XVIII, 9), which means not the essence but the quality of divinity. For examples of θεότης cf. Lucian, *Icarom.* IX ; Plutarch, *De def. orac.*, X, *De Isid. et Osir.*, XXII ; for the different force of the two words cf. the two passages in Plutarch, *Mor.*, p. 857 A and *Mor*, p. 415 C. The Latin versions render both θεότης and θειότης by *divinitas ;* at a later date *deitas* was coined to represent θεότης ; cf. Aug. *de civ. Dei*, VII, 1 : " Hanc divinitatem vel, ut sic dixerim, *deitatem*; nam et hoc verbo uti jam nostros non piget, ut de Graeco expressius transferant id quod illi θεότητα appellant ".

The term σωματικῶς has been variously interpreted. Since in Col. I, 17

union of the divine and human natures, the former which Christ had from all eternity and the latter which He assumed in time, is that of Phil. II, 6-7: " Jesus Christ being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God, but emptied himself, taking the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of men, and in habit found as a man ", Ἰ. Χ. ὃς ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων οὐχ ἁρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ, ἀλλὰ ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν μορφὴν δούλου λαβών, ἐν ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων γενόμενος [1] καὶ σχήματι εὑρεθεὶς ὡς ἄνθρωπος. As we already indicated above when we studied in part this very important Christological text [2], the μορφὴ θεοῦ denotes the divine nature of Christ, the μορφὴ δούλου His human nature. Existing before the worlds in the eternal Godhead, Christ did not treat His being on an equality with God (τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ) as a treasure greedily to be clutched (ἁρπαγμὸς) [3]; on

---

σῶμα is once opposed to σκιά, some following St. Aug. (Epist. CXLIX) understand it to mean " really " not " typically ". Others translate the word as " wholly " (JEROME, *in Is.*, XI, 1) or as " essentially " (HILARY, *de Trin.*, VIII, 54). But these explanations, although they are theologically possible, do not render correctly the word σωματικῶς. Saint Paul's language is carefully guarded ; he does not say ἐν σώματι, because the Godhead cannot be confined to any limits of space, nor σωματοειδῶς, for this might suggest the unreality of Christ's human body, but σωματικῶς i. e. become incarnate. The statement κατοικεῖ πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τῆς θεότητος = ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν θεόν καὶ θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος of St. John, while σωματικῶς = καὶ λόγος σάρξ ἐγένετο. Cf. ABBOTT, *Ephesians and Colossians*, p. 248 f., LIGHTFOOT, o. c., 182, PRAT, o. c., vol. II[6], p. 182 f.

1. Note the use of ὑπάρχων (cf. Lk. XXIII, 50; Acts II, 30; II Cor. VIII, 17, XII. 16; Rom. IV, 19) with μορφὴ θεοῦ, and γενόμενος (cf. Rom. I, 3; Gal. IV, 4) in connection with the human birth of Christ.

2. The chapter in which the text occurs has not in its *ensemble* a dogmatic character but is rather an exhortation to peace, charity, and Christian humility. Says PRAT, o. c., vol. I[9], p. 373 : " On est stupéfait de rencontrer cette doctrine sublime jetée comme en passant, dans un morceau parénétique, sans arrière-pensée de controverse, comme s'il s'agissait d'un dogme vulgaire, depuis longtemps connu et cru de tous, qu'il suffit de rappeler pour en faire la base d'une exhortation morale : fait déconcertant en vérité et tout à fait inexplicable si l'on ne suppose que la préexistence du Christ et l'union en sa personne de la divinité et de l'humanité faisaient partie de la catéchèse apostolique et appartenaient à ces articles élémentaires que nul chrétien ne devait ignorer ".

3. The term ἁρπαγμὸς may be taken in an active or in a passive sense. According to the former ἁρπαγμὸς = *rapina*, according to the latter ἁρπαγμὸς = *res digna quae retineatur*. The active sense was usually adopted by the Latin Fathers and by the Vulgate, the passive by the Greek Fathers. When applied to the text in Phil. II, 5 ff. ἁρπαγμὸς in the active sense gives us, according to LABOURT, art. *Notes d'exégèse sur Philipp. II*, 5-11, RB, 1898, p. 409, the following translation : " Ayez les mêmes sentiments que Jésus Christ, qui étant dans la forme de Dieu, n'a pas cru usurper l'égalité avec Dieu (c'est-

the contrary, He spontaneously resigned the divine honors to which He had a right, took upon Himself the nature of a servant, and concealed the form of God under the form of a slave. In fact, since the divine nature is immutable, the κένωσις cannot be regarded as a diminution or a laying aside (note ὑπάρχων) of this nature. On the other hand, since Christ during His earthly existence remained true man, a fact, which was evident from His external appearances (σχήματι ὡς ἄνθρωπος) as well as from His humiliations, sufferings, and death on the Cross, the κένωσις was not an absorption of the human nature by the divine. At the moment of the Incarnation the form of God and the form of a slave united, therefore, without commixture or confusion, and Christ is perfect God and perfect man : *Manens quod erat assumpsit quod non erat,* and again, *Nihil assumpto divinum, nihil assumenti deest humanum.*

But how then can it be said that Christ ἐκένωσεν ἑαυτόν? The ultimate basis of the κένωσις is to be found in the Incarnation, in the hypostatic union itself. The κένωσις is an act whereby the *Verbum* renounces not the divine nature which

---

à-dire commettre une usurpation en s'arrogeant l'égalité avec Dieu) mais s'est dépouillé, prenant la forme d'esclave ". On the contrary if ἁρπαγμὸς is taken in the passive sense : " Ayez les mêmes sentiments que Jésus Christ, qui, bien qu'étant dans la forme de Dieu, n'a pas cru devoir s'attacher avidement aux prérogatives qui lui revenaient de par son égalité avec Dieu, mais s'est dépouillé lui-même, prenant la forme de serviteur " etc. Those who prefer the active sense insist on the fact that derivates in — μός have usually the active sense. Besides, ἅρπαγμα, the passive, occurs at least 17 times in the LXX, why then should Saint Paul prefer ἁρπαγμὸς ? Among profane authors only one instance of the use of ἁρπαγμὸς is quoted (PLUTARCH, *De educat. puer.* 15). But these reasons are not decisive. Certain derivates in — μός as φραγμός and σταλαγμός are used in the passive sense (cf. AESCHL., *Theb.*, 60, *Eum.*, 260 ; SOPH., *Fr.*, 340 ; EURIP., *Son.*, 351). Again, in many patristic texts we find ἁρπαγμὸς used in the passive sense (cf. CYRIL AL., *De adorat.*, I ; LXVIII, 172 C, EUSEB., *in Luc.*, VI ; XXIV, 537 C, JOHN CHRYS., *Hom.* VI-VII ; LXII, 219-229). Moreover, the active sense neglects the foregoing words in the context. For the Apostle is there enforcing the duty of humility, and when he adds " Have the mind which was in Jesus Christ ", we expect this appeal to be followed by a reference not to the right which Christ claimed but to the dignity which He renounced. Again the passive sense better explains the use of ἀλλὰ after οὐχ as well as the emphatic position of ἁρπαγμὸν. Finally, the latter sense has in its favor the authority of the Greek Fathers who were in a position to appreciate the exigencies of their language. Cf. LIGHTFOOT, *Epistle to the Philippians,* p. 133 ff., III, VINCENT, *Philippians and Philemon,* p. 57 ff. ; for the history of the interpretation of the word ἁρπαγμὸς cf. SCHUMACHER, *Christus in seiner Präexistenz und Kenose nach Phil.* 2, 5-8, pp. 17-129.

can undergo neither diminution nor change but something belonging to it, namely the extrinsic glories and honors due to the divinity, the adoration it merits from reasonable creatures; of all these external goods the Word voluntarily "emptied" Himself when He united Himself to a nature which in the order of Providence was destined to humiliations, sufferings, and death. This interpretation, we think, is suggested by the immediate context : the expression, τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ determines at once the two parallel members, οὐχ ἁρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο and ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν. Since the latter phrase of itself conveys an imperfect idea, the question at once arises, of what did Christ empty Himself ? And the only answer is, He emptied Himself of that which He did not regard as an ἁρπαγμὸν, namely, equality of honors with God, the prerogatives of His divine majesty.

It is not within the scope of this present study to enter into an examination of the countless modern theories on the Kenosis [1]. What we would wish to remark, however, is the fact that it is usually under some form of the κένωσις that contemporary conservative Protestants present their teaching concerning the divinity of Christ. The latter all admit that there was something divine in Our Lord. But when they come to define this divine element, this " something ", we find that there are *tot sententiae quot capita.* No longer accepting the Christian solution of the fourth and fifth centuries, these theologians, in an attempt to give us a better solution, take refuge in a theory which derives its formula from Phil. II, 5 ff. ; and in their hands the κένωσις is portioned and diversified *ad infinitum.* Each one imposes that " emptying " or that sacrifice upon Christ which the exigencies of his particular philosophy demand. For if Saint Paul says that Christ " emptied " Himself, why not conclude that He " emptied " Himself of a part or of all His attributes ? Why not say, as the Lutherans of the last century, that Christ during His earthly existence ceased to be God altogether ? Why not distinguish at least between certain fundamental and intrinsic attributes which the Incarnate Word retained, and certain extrinsic attributes, as omniscience and ubiquity, which are not proper to the " form of man " ?

The theories of conservative Protestantism, by maintaining

1. Cf. SCHUMACHER, o.c., pp. 193-229; the reader will also find a complete bibliography on the subject on pp. XIII-XXX.

that the Incarnate Word renounced certain properties either constitutive of or consecutive to the possession of the divine nature, abandon what the Catholic Church has always considered as the corner-stone of the dogma of the Incarnation, and are plainly outside of the Christian tradition. Christ for them is after all a human person. Jesus Christ is, if you will, a man divinized in some mysterious way, so that the title " Son of God " and the powers known to us from the Scriptures can be attributed to Him ; He was favored by a prophetic inspiration and an effusion of the Holy Spirit more abundantly than others, and consequently enjoyed the more singular prerogatives. But, strictly speaking, we cannot speak of the divinity *of* Christ but merely of the divinity *in* Christ ; we cannot adore Christ but only God in Christ. The " subconcious " rationalism of conservative Protestants has led them to propose theories which in last resort resolve themselves into those of the Liberal Protestants and clearly suppress what the Catholic Church understands by the divinity of Christ.

A theory which here merits our attention, both because of the renown of its author and because it is perhaps already a theory of the Incarnation to be based on the postulates of Bergsonian philosophy, is that of Sanday [1]. The great difficulty for Sanday is not the Catholic doctrine of the Incarnation which he professes to admit in its essentials [2] but its traditional presentation. To him it seem artificial to conceive two natures, having their distinct operations, and nevertheless, by a system of mutual communications permitting the transfer of attributes from one of these natures to the other [3]. He considers it extremely difficult to trace, so to say, a vertical line between the human and divine natures of Christ, and to say that some actions fall on one side and some on the other side of the line [4]. Hence the author proposes to take his stand solely on the conscience of Christ. The (clear) conscience of Christ, Sanday tells us, was a conscience wholly and exclusively human. It was a Messianic conscience, slowly developed in the course of Christ's infancy and later experiences ; by it Jesus knew that He was the expected prophet, the ambassador

1. *Christologies Ancient and Modern*, lectures VI and VII.
2. Ibid., pp. 166, 173.
3. Ibid., pp. 54-55.
4. Ibid., p. 165.

of God on earth, founder of the kingdom, and judge of the world ; on it was also based Christ's notion of the Servant of Jahweh, the Suffering Just, the Redeemer, and the sentiment of so close a union with His Father that it could only be expressed by the name of " Son ". But the clear conscience of Christ was not the measure of His humanity. Below this superficial Ego lay another Ego, very real but subliminal, containing the inexhaustible and ineffable treasures of Christ's Divinity of which Saint Paul so often speaks. It was thence that ascended little by little, under form of presentiment or suggestion, the knowledge and manifestation of the divine element in Jesus. From time to time the Deity present in Christ's subliminal self confusedly revealed itself in certain words of Jesus which the collective Christian conscience interpreted later in a clearer and fuller sense than Jesus Himself.

However " timely " the above interpretation may be, to us it presents many difficulties [1]. In the first place, how far is the subliminal conscience a necessary part of human nature ? Is it compatible with the knowledge which Catholic theology attributes to Christ ? Again, how according to the above theory can we know the existence of the divine element in Christ ? Can our estimate of Christ go beyond that which He had of Himself ? Jesus was not conscious, we are told, of being God, although God in reality He was ; His words, His clear and distinct thoughts, never went so far ; however, does not Scripture represent Christ as clearly knowing whence He came and whither He was going, and are not the restrictions which He imposes upon the manifestations of His real nature and character always represented as voluntary ? Moreover, is Christianity the fruit of posterior reflexions on a certain number of mere suggestions expressed by the Master ? Of course, perhaps we ought not expect that the above theory be supported by Scripture and Tradition since there is question, we are told, of a " new discovery " ! In the Pauline Epistles, it is true, the life of the historical Christ seems to stand in the background, while the glorious Christ seems to occupy the Apostle's whole attention. The texts that might be adduced in favor of the above theory are Rom. 1, 4 and Phil. 11, 5-11 ;

1. Cf. GRANDMAISON, art. *Un essai de Christologie moderne*, RechSR, 1911, pp. 190-208.

in the former the Apostle says : " He was predestinated the Son of God in power, according to the spirit of sanctification, by the resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ " ; but does not the learned exegete himself elsewhere tell us [1] that the declaration of Christ on the day of Resurrection as Son of God had reference not to the Exalted Redeemer but to the disciples? Is not, therefore, an exegesis, which sees in the text a manifestation to the Risen Christ of His own divinity, gratuitous and without foundation? Again, the attempt to find in the κένωσις of Phil. II, 5 ff. a humanity deprived of what assured its supreme honor as well as its efficacious redeeming value, and reduced to a vague instinct or attenuated ignorance, has likewise no basis in the text ; the passage implies a κένωσις in the Incarnate Word but the object of this κένωσις is clearly indicated : Christ did not empty Himself of the μορφὴ θεοῦ but only of its *apanage* i. e., equality of honors with God (τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ). The theory of Sanday is not without significance. It shows that an attempt to express the mysterious object of faith in terms of contemporary philosophy involves the danger of losing the very " thing " of the dogma, the very substance of revelation. Of course, the " subliminal " is a *notion à la mode,* it has an *allure savante.* But in spite of the systematizing which the theory has undergone the notion of the " subconscious " still remains vague and indefinite ; however, for that very reason it is the more adapted to receive and have relegated into its obscure domain the mysteries which some find difficult to understand or to accept.

Although Saint Paul gives us only two brief formulas for the Incarnation of the preexistent Word, he nevertheless often and emphatically asserts that Jesus Christ was true man, like unto other men except sin. If Christ vanquished sin and death it was because of His solidarity with us : " For by a man came death, and by a man the resurrection of the dead " (I Cor. XV, 21), and, " if by the offense of one many died, much more the

1. *Epistle to the Romans*[5], pp. 7-8 : " Now it is certain that St. Paul did not hold that the Son of God *became* Son by the Resurrection. The undoubted Epistles are clear on this point (esp. II Cor. IV, 4. VIII, 9 ; cf. Col. I, 15-19). At the same time he *did* regard the Resurrection as making a difference — if not in the transcendental relations of the Father to the Son (which lie beyond our cognisance), yet in the visible manifestation of Sonship as addressed to the understanding of men ". Cf. also LEBRETON, *Les origines du dogme de la Trinité*[4], p. 379.

grace of God, and the gift by the grace of one man, Jesus Christ abounded unto many " (Rom. v, 15). If Christ is perfect mediator it is because He partakes of our nature : " There is one God, and one mediator of God and men, the man Christ Jesus " (I Tim. II, 5). And again, " what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son, in the likeness of sinful flesh and of sin, hath condemned sin in the flesh " (Rom. VIII, 3). When the Apostle says that He Who was in the " form of God " took the " form of a servant " and appeared in the " likeness of men ", far from denying the truth of His human nature, he immediately adds that Christ " was found as a man " by His external appearances and by His life of obedience and sufferings (Phil. II, 5-8). As true man and subject to the Law, Christ was born in the " fulness of time " (Gal. IV, 4 ; cf. John I, 14 ; Lk. II, 21, 27), and appeared in the " flesh " i. e., in the human composite (I Tim. III, 16 ; cf. Col. I, 22 ; Eph. II, 14 ; Rom. VIII, 3); He was " made of a woman " (Gal. IV, 4) — a phrase which probably indicates the miraculous and Virgin birth of Christ, for while it is true that all the Apostle says is that He was born of a woman, yet notwithstanding the importance which as a Jew he attached to it, he says nothing of male generation.

It is sometimes maintained especially by the followers of the Tübingen school that the Apostle had but a vague knowledge of the historical Christ [1]. Their contention is usually based on the following text : " Wherefore henceforth we know no man according to the flesh. And if we have known Christ according to the flesh, but now we know him so no longer " (II Cor. v, 16) [2]. If any one will examine the context, however,

1. For the " Jesus or Paul " problem cf. FILLION, *Jésus ou Paul* (cath.), five articles in RCF, 1912, KNOWLING, *The Testimony of St. Paul to Christ*, London, 1905, FEINE, *Jesus Christus und Paulus*, Leipzig, 1902, GOGUEL, *L'Apôtre Paul et Jésus Christ*, Paris, 1904, DAUSCH, *Jesus und Paulus* (cath.), in coll., *Biblische Zeitfragen*, Münster, 1911, and OLAF MOE, *Paulus und die evangelische Geschichte*, Leipzig, 1912. Cf. also our art. *St. Paul and Christianity*, ACQR, 1920, pp. 565-593.

2. RAMSAY, *The Teaching of Paul in Terms of the Present Day*, pp. 21-30, and in Exp. May 1901, pp. 356-360, understands this text to mean that Saint Paul had seen Our Lord during His earthly life. Ramsey's opinion seems to be supported by the Apostle's statement in I Cor. IX, 1 : " Am not I an apostle ? Have not I seen Christ Jesus our Lord? " But here Saint Paul cannot possibly be alluding to any knowledge of Jesus before His crucifixion ; he certainly cannot base any argument on this acquaintance in favor of his apostolate since such a meeting would have taken place while he still disbelieved

he will see that the distinction noted in the text is not between the historical and glorified Christ but between Christ as conceived by the unbelieving Judaizers and as spiritually apprehended by the Apostle ; to see Christ as He manifested Himself in His Death and Resurrection is a privilege which belongs only to a Christian enlightened by the grace of the Holy Spirit. Saint Paul elsewhere expresses the same contrast : " We preach Christ crucified, unto the Jews indeed a stumbling-block, and unto the Gentiles foolishness. But unto them that are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God, and the wisdom of God. For the foolishness of God is wiser than men, and the weakness of God is stronger than men " (I Cor. I, 23-25).

Besides, the Apostle's knowledge of Christ was not as scant as is sometimes pretended. Not only does Saint Paul repeatedly tell us that Jesus Christ was true man, but he also knows that Our Lord was a Jew, a son of Abraham (Gal. III, 16). Enumerating the prerogatives of the Israelites, Saint Paul singles out above all the fact that of them is " Christ according to the flesh " (Rom. IX, 5 ; cf. IV, I ; Mt. I, 1-16). The same Christ was a descendant of David ; it was the Apostle's mission to proclaim the *laetum nuntium* " concerning His Son, who was

---

in Him. It can only apply to the appearance of Christ to him on the way to Damascus or to some subsequent revelation (cf. Acts XVIII, 9, XXII, 18 ; II Cor. XII, 1). Indeed, the question, " who art thou Lord ? " (Acts IX, 5, XXII, 8, XXVI, 15) in his conversion, seems distinctly to imply that the personal appearance of the Lord was unknown to him. Had he been in Jerusalem when Our Lord came there for the last Pasch, had he been present at the scenes in the Sanhedrin and the Praetorium, he surely would have violently opposed Jesus ; and if later he so pathetically complained that he persecuted the Church of God, would he not have reproached himself even more for having persecuted the Master ? Had he been present at the sacrifice on Golgotha, to which he afterwards looked as the most momentous event in the whole of history, would there be no allusions to it in his writings ? Hence a probable explanation is that at this time he was at Tarsus, which after his conversion he regarded as his home (Acts IX, 30, XI, 25 ; Gal. I, 21). His studies at Jerusalem were now over, and because of his poor health be probably returned to his native city. Still another explanation of his absence from Jerusalem may be found in Gal. V, 11, where he represents himself as having once been a preacher of the circumcision. One of the special characteristics of Pharisaism was an active zeal in winning proselytes as is evident from Our Lord's warning in Mt. XXIII, 15 (cf. Acts, II, 10, VI, 5, XIII, 43). Now we know from Saint Paul's Epistles how impetuous was his zeal and how restless his desire of doing good during his missionary career among the Gentiles. His conversion, while it changed his earliest and most fundamental convictions, only gave a new direction but did not destroy his impulsive temperament which no doubt also worked in him when he was a preacher of Judaism.

made to him of the seed of David " (Rom. I, 3, XV, 12 ; II Tim. II, 8).

Our Lord's manifestation to the world is not in a manner consistent with His nature rights and exalted titles, but He appears as a servant of all. The Apostle, writing to the Church of Corinth, tells them that the churches of Macedonia, afflicted as they were, yet with a spontaneous liberality and affectionate enthusiasm for his wishes subscribed large amounts for the collection of the saints ; so too the Corinthians abounding in so many gifts and graces should abound in this ; he would not order them, but only asks a proof of their love even as Christ had set the example of enriching others by His own poverty : " For you know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that being rich, he became poor for our sakes, that through his poverty you might be rich " (II Cor. VIII, 9). While the reference in this passage is not specifically to Our Lord's poverty in material things, but to the poorness of His earthly life as compared with His heavenly glory, yet the context to the passage shows that most probably the poverty of the life of Jesus helped to complete the picture of His self-denial. The same idea seems to be implied in the well-known passage of the Epistle to the Philippians (II, 6-9). In striving to urge upon these the example of humility and unselfishness as the only possible basis of unity, Saint Paul sets before them the Divine lowliness which had descended step by step into the very abyss of degradation, yes, even to death on the Cross.

The Saviour was of a meek and humble disposition — Saint Paul beseeches the Corinthians through the " mildness and modesty of Christ " (II Cor. X, 1) not to despise his apostolic authority. He had " brethren " one of whom was called James (Gal. I, 19 ; I Cor. IX, 5). He lived in the midst of the Jews (Rom. XV, 8 ; I Thess. II, 15), and Jerusalem is the center of His Church (Gal. I, 17 ; Rom. XV, 19-27). He came to preach peace to the Gentiles " that were afar off, and peace to them that were nigh " (Eph. II, 17, 14). He chose from among His disciples twelve apostles, several of whom are mentioned by name (Gal. I, 18-19, II, 9), who were to continue His ministry (I Cor. XV, 5, 14, XV, 5-9) ; among those St. Peter occupies a position of prominence (I Cor. XV, 5, IX, 5, I, 12 ; Gal. II, 7) ; He gave them the order to preach the Gospel and the right to live of the altar (I Cor. IX, 15) as well as the power to work

miracles (II Cor. XII, 19 ; cf. Rom. XV, 19). He limited His own ministry to Israel, and did not go outside the confines of Palestine, for no other purpose than to fulfil the promises given to His people : " for I say that Jesus Christ was minister of the circumcision for the truth of God to confirm the promises made unto the fathers " (Rom. XV, 8). He is an adequate subject for imitation by men (I Cor. XI, 1, IV, 16). After having lived on earth a life of poverty and subjection (II Cor. VIII, 9 ; Phil. II, 8), of obedience (Rom. V, 15-19) and holiness (Rom. I, 4), He voluntarily delivered Himself to His enemies (Gal. I, 4, II, 20), the Jews, who put Him to death (I Thess. II, 19).

When we come to the institution of the Eucharist we find that the Apostle gives us a minute and detailed account, one which would well fit into the Synoptic scene and which testifies that the author was well capable of writing as a historian. The house of Chloe had broken to him the news that the Church assemblies and Sunday services had become noisy and disorderly. Even the Agapae lost their traditional purpose in connection with the Eucharist. The deadly leaven of selfishness, greediness, egotism and drunkenness, insinuated itself into these once simple and charitable gatherings. The simple narrative of the institution and object of the Lord's Supper, and the solemn warning which attended its profanation,is meant to serve as a remedy against these gross disorders. The Lord's Supper is traced for us in all its dramatic beauty : it was the same night in which He was betrayed, Jesus takes bread, blesses and breaks it ; in like manner after He had supped, He takes the chalice : he pronounces the sacramental words over both species, adding each time the recommendation which should perpetuate the mystery (I Cor. XI, 23-24 ; cf. Mt. XXVI, 26-28 ; Mk. XIV, 22-24 ; Lk. XXII, 17-20). It is worthy of note in this connection that the reference to the Lord's Supper was called forth by certain disorders in the Church at Corinth. Had no such occasion existed, the epistles of Saint Paul might have been altogether silent about the Eucharist, and then the critics would certainly hasten to assure us that Saint Paul knew nothing about it.

The allusions to the death of Our Saviour are very numerous, being called forth by their dogmatic value. Saint Paul tells us that Our Lord took His repast with the disciples on " the *same*

night on which he was *betrayed*" (I Cor. xi, 23). Though the Passion is described in general terms (I Cor. i, 17-23; Phil. iii, 10), we know that the Apostle painted the image of the Crucified in vivid colors before the eyes of the Galatians (Gal. iii, 1). In fact, he often speaks of the Cross (I Cor. i, 18, 23; Gal. vi, 14; Col. i, 23, 18, ii, 14; Eph. ii, 16), of the Blood (Rom. iii, 25, v, 8, 9; Col. i, 19, 20; Eph. i, 7, ii, 13), of the Death (I Cor. xv, 3; Gal. i, 4), and of the burial (I Cor. xv, 4; cf. Rom. vi, 4; Col. ii, 12).

So too the Resurrection of Our Lord is strongly attested in Saint Paul's Epistles, especially in that immortal chapter (xv) to the Corinthians in which he confirms their faith in this doctrine, and removes their difficulties concerning it. If they would not nullify their acceptance of the gospel in which they stood and by which they were saved, they must hold fast the truths which he again declares to them, namely, " that Christ died for our sins ..... and that he rose again the *third* day according to the Scriptures " (xv, 3-4). He enumerates the Saviour's appearances to Cephas, to the twelve, to more than five hundred at once, of whom the majority were still living, to James, to all the Apostles, and lastly to him as " one born out of due time ". That Saint Paul had taken much trouble to obtain sound evidence of the fact of the Resurrection is clear from his emphatic statement : " If Christ be not risen again, then is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain " (xv, 14). The day of the resurrection seems to have a religious significance for Saint Paul, for on that day he established the weekly offertory for the saints at Jerusalem. Finally, we read that Jesus Christ ascended into heaven (Eph. iv, 8-10), that He sits on the right hand of the Father (Eph. i, 20, ii, 16), and that He will come to judge the living and the dead (I Thess. i, 10, iv, 16; II Thess. i, 7; Phil. iii, 20).

Saint Paul, however, not only describes the life and deeds of the Saviour but frequently reproduces or refers to His teaching. Thus, writing to the Corinthians on the subject of Christian marriage, he says, " But *to them that are married, not I, but the Lord, commandeth,* that the wife depart not from her husband " (I Cor. vii, 10). The Apostle does not legislate in his own name except when he has *no command from the Lord:* " *concerning virgins, I have no commandment of the Lord* " (I Cor. vii, 25). In the same Epistle he appeals to the rule

of Christ, when he maintains that as an apostle he has the right to expect the churches to support him : " So also *the Lord ordained that they who preach the gospel, should live by the gospel* " (I Cor. IX, 14). Again, he introduces his account of the Lord's Supper by the following words : " For *I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you* " (I. Cor. XI, 23). He tells the Thessalonians " in the *word of the Lord* " that those who were still alive at the second coming should not be beforehand with, should gain no advantage or priority over those who slept (I Thess. IV, 14). In his Epistle to the Galatians, where he defends his teaching and his authority, he says that it was by revelation that Christ made known to him the mystery that the Gentiles are co-partakers and co-heirs of the promises in Christ Jesus (Gal. I, 11-12). He definitely refers to the authority of the Lord in a passage to which there is no parallel in the Gospels : " *Remember the words of our Lord Jesus how he himself said, it is more blessed to give than to receive* " (Acts XX, 35). Elsewhere he appeals to a " law " which he supposes as known to the neophytes : " *bear ye one another's burdens, and so you shall fulfil the law of Christ* " (Gal. VI, 2). The moral precepts which he lays down are not of himself but of Jesus Christ : " *You know what precepts I have given to you by the Lord Jesus* " (I Thess. IV, 2) ; to disregard them would be to disobey the orders of the Master (I Cor. IV, 17 ; I Tim. VI, 3) [1].

1. If the Apostle does not appeal beyond these few instances to the Saviour's words to establish or defend his doctrines, we must remember that he was far from regarding the teaching of Jesus as a collection of sayings, a law or written letter, which he could merely quote at every turn. From the beginning Christ was for Saint Paul not so much the herald or preacher of the Gospel as an object of the Apostle's faith and teaching. To know what Jesus Christ had said or done seemed less important than to love Him and give oneself to Him. Says SANDAY, *Epistle to the Romans*[5], p. 382 : " Christianity is older than any of its records. The books of the N. T. reflect, they do not originated the teaching of early Christianity. Moreover, our Lord originated principles. It was these principles which inspired His followers; some of the words which are the product of and which taught those principles are preserved, some are not; but the result of them is contained in the words of the Apostles, which worked out in practical life the principles they had learnt directly or indirectly from the Christ ".

Nevertheless, compare the following remarkable coincidences and allusions :

Rom. XII, 14, 17, 20,	and Mt. V, 44.	I Cor. XIII, 2,	and Mt. XXVII, 19, 20.
Rom. XIII, 7,	" Mt. XXII, 21.	I Cor. IV, 12, 13,	" Lk. VI, 28.
Rom. XIII, 9,	" Mt. XXII, 39, 40.	Gal. IV, 17,	" Mt. XXIII, 13.
I Cor. VII, 10-11,	" Mt. V, 32.	I Thess. IV, 8,	" Lk. X, 16.
I Cor. IX, 13,	" Lk. X, 7.		

Besides these testimonies which can be adduced from Saint Paul's Epistles to show that the Apostle's knowledge of the historical Christ is all that could be desired, it is necessary to state in addition a few general considerations. In the first place, the critics lay too much stress on the argument from silence. Confident assertions and inferences based on silence are dangerous. Thus, for example, the common authorship of the Fourth Gospel and the Johannine Epistles is undoubted. Now in the Gospel, St. John gives us an account of the human life of Christ, shows interest in it, in fact there seems to be internal evidence in his Gospel that he was acquainted with the Synoptic account (I, 26, 27, 32, 33, VI, 68, XII, 27). But if we examine the Epistles we find in them a characterization of Christ even more transcendental than in Saint Paul, and scarcely a single reference to the human life of Jesus (cf. I John IV, 2). If we had no fourth Gospel, could any one conclude from the silence of the Epistles that the author was ignorant of the gospel story ? Or again, if we argue that Saint Paul was ignorant of the Gospel narrative because of his scanty references to the earthly ministry of Christ, what is to be said of the Epistle of James or of the Petrine Epistles, Christian literature, which according to critical authority is of later date than the Pauline Epistles and whose authors were familiar with the gospel story ? Yet we find in them less reference to the earthly life of Jesus than in Saint Paul's Epistles. And to expand this argument from silence still further, what is to be said of John the Baptist, whose mission is attested by secular history ? Saint Paul must have heard of that mission even before he heard of Jesus, and as a zealous Jew he must have been keenly interested therein (Acts XXIII, 24), but in his Epistles he nowhere mentions the great precursor. Similarly, although he was a Roman citizen, he makes no allusion to events of contemporary Roman history.

Again, Saint Paul everywhere presupposes what is known as the apostolic catechesis, an oral instruction which the apostles imparted to the neophytes before or after baptism (cf. Mt. XXVIII, 19 ; Mk. XVI, 15). Hence the Apostle knew more than he tells us in his epistles, and what he omits formed part of the essential elements of his preaching. It is omitted not because it is unimportant, but on the contrary because it is fundamental. Instruction about it had to be given from the very beginning,

and did not often have to be repeated. Saint Paul was a missionary before he was a theologian, and preached the Gospel in places where neither Jesus nor the Messias had ever been heard of. All this early historical instruction about the life of Christ necessarily therefore belonged to a period of Saint Paul's life antecedent to that which gave rise to his epistles. If his writings therefore do not contain many allusions to the Gospel narrative, they nevertheless assume in their believing readers a previous and fairly detailed knowledge of the history of Jesus. We have ample evidence in the Pauline Epistles to show that in the primitive Church such a preliminary oral instruction was given to the catechumens (I Cor. IV, 17 ; Rom. VI, 17 ; Heb. VI, 12 ; cf. Acts XVIII, 25 ; Lk. I, 4). Thus when writing to the Thessalonians, Saint Paul admonishes them not to be stationary but to advance more and more in that Christian cause which he had marked out for them : " We pray and beseech you in the Lord Jesus, that as you have received from us, how you ought to walk, and to please God, so also you would walk, that you may abound the more " (I Thess. IV, 1 ; cf. Eph. IV, 1). He exhorts them to " stand fast and hold the traditions (παραδόσεις), ", which they had received from his words and his genuine letter (II Thess. II, 15 ; cf. I Cor. XI, 2). They are to have no intercourse with all those who were " walking disorderly and not according to the tradition which they have received from us " (II Thess. III, 6). So too in his first Epistle to the Corinthians, in trying to dispel their doubts and anxieties on the subject of the resurrection of the dead, he recalls to them his oral preaching : " I make known to you, brethren, the gospel which I preached to you, which also you have received and wherein you stand ; by which also you are saved, if you hold fast after what manner I preached unto you, unless you have believed in vain " (I Cor. XV, 1 ff.). But not only does the Apostle allude to his own preliminary oral instruction, but he makes us understand in his epistles that there were catechists who either voluntarily or officially instructed the neophytes : " And let him that is instructed in the word, communicate to him that instructeth him, in all good things " (Gal. VI, 6) The simple biography of Jesus no doubt belonged to this primitive catechesis and hence it was not necessary that Saint Paul should retrace it again in his Epistles.

Thirdly, Saint Paul must have known of Jesus Christ already

before his conversion[1]. He was in intimate relation with the leaders of the Sanhedrin who contrived and brought about the death of Jesus. Being a man of keen intelligence, he would not take it for granted that an obscure visitor to the feast was suddenly seized and crucified because of some indiscreet utterances, but he would diligently inquire concerning the events which led up to the crucifixion. During the stoning of Stephen (Acts VII, 58 ff.), and during his fierce persecutions of the Christians he must have continually heard some reminiscences of the Saviour.

Again, Saint Paul was a man of commanding genius, of keen and alert human interest, and of an emotional temperament. He was a man of marked characteristics, of an intense individuality, and marvellous intellectual power. He was disciplined in the technicalities and methods of Jewish theological training. He had sat as a " disciple of the wise " at the feet of the most eminent of the rabbis, and had been selected as an inquisitional agent of the Sanhedrin because he surpassed his contemporaries in burning zeal for the traditions of the schools. He was intensely interested in all that concerned his people and his own religion. Hence it is hard to believe that such a man was ignorant of anything concerning Jesus and His life on earth. For is it possible that during his whole sojourn at Damascus he would not question the faithful concerning the mortal life of

1. It is also to be noted that Saint Paul could not before his conversion have persecuted the Church without knowing something of its Founder and of His teaching. In two of his speeches and four of his epistles the Apostle reverts to his persecution of the Church. Twice to the Galatians does he use the same strong metaphor which was applied to his conduct by the Damascene believers (I, 13, I, 23). He tells the Corinthians that he is " the least of the Apostles, not worthy to be called an apostle, because he persecuted the Church of God " (I Cor. XV, 9). He reminds the Philippians that his old Hebraic zeal as a Pharisee had shown itself by his " persecuting the Church " (Phil. III. 6). Even in his old age when he was thoroughly convinced that he was entirely forgiven by his Master, he cannot forget the bitter thought that, though in ignorance, he had once been " a blasphemer and a persecutor and contumelious " (I Tim. I, 13). And when speaking on the steps of the Tower of Antonia to the raging mob of Jerusalem, he tells them not only of the shedding of the blood of Stephen and of the binding and imprisonment of Christians, but also that " he persecuted this way unto death " (Acts XXII, 4). Finally in his speech at Cesarea he says that armed with the high priest's authority he not only fulfilled unwittingly the prophecy of Christ (Mt. X, 17 ; Mk. XIII, 9) by scourging the Christians often and in every synagogue, but that when it came to a question of death he gave his vote against them, and compelled them to blaspheme (Acts XXVI, 11). And when he was arrested on his way to Damascus, he was on an errand to persecute the Church even in that distant city.

his master ? That he had learned and retained nothing of his conversations at Antioch and at Jerusalem with the prince of the Apostles (Gal. I, 18), with the beloved disciple (Gal. II, 9), with James (Gal. I, 18-19), Barnabas (Acts XI, 26, XIII, 4, XV, 39), Silas (Acts XV, 40), and with the other members of the nascent Church ? That he passed so many years with the future historians of Jesus, St. Mark (Acts XIII, 5 ; Col. IV, 10) and St. Luke (Col. IV, 14 ; II Tim. IV, 11), without having heard of the miracles and discourses of the great Wonder-Worker whose preaching had revolutionized the world ? It is inconceivable that Saint Paul would take no interest in the life of Him for whom he was willing to suffer the loss of all things and count them as dung (Phil III, 8) [1]. The claim that a crucified Jew was to be obeyed as Lord and trusted as Master must surely have provoked the question as to what kind of a man Jesus was.

Finally, we must be careful not to regard Saint Paul's epistles as deliberate treatises and systematic expositions of Christian theology. We must not consider them as something studied and literary. Saint Paul's Epistles were simple letters, not personal, but pastoral, written on a specific occasion and to a particular body of converts. They were suggestions in regard to local difficulties or arrangements, or words of counsel, encouragement, or consolation. They were subsidiary to the ordinary teaching, and he does not dwell in them on anything which is not a matter of controversy or difficulty. Hence they were not called forth by any inward purpose or necessity

1. The Apostle repeatedly tells us that Christ is the center of his life and of his teaching. " For I judged not myself to know anything among you, but Jesus Christ, and Him crucified " (I Cor, II, 2). Whence his plain statement : " For we preach not ourselves, but Jesus Christ our Lord " (II Cor. IV, 5) and that " other foundation no man can lay but which is laid, which is Christ Jesus " (I Cor. III, 11). For the sake of the transcendence of the knowledge of Christ Jesus the Apostle was mulcted of all things (Phil. III, 8). Christ is his very life : " I live, now not I, but Christ liveth in me " (Gal. II, 20). Christ alone is his supreme glory : " God forbid that I should glory save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ " (Gal. VI, 14). The Apostle constantly puts his own personality behind that of Christ in order that He alone may be preached, and is always yearning for the day to be dissolved and be with Him. In fact Christ is the central-point of his epistles. Open at random anyone of his epistles, and infallibly some reference to the nature and works of the God-man will be found. The name " Christ " appears 203 times in the Epistles, " Christ Jesus " 92 times, " Jesus Christ " 84 times, " Lord " 157 times, " Lord Jesus " 24 times, " The Lord Jesus Christ " 64 times, " Jesus " 16 times. Besides these we find many other titles such as Saviour, Son of God, and other incidental phrases where Our Lord is not mentioned directly by name.

on the part of the Apostle to formulate his thought, but each of them in response to particular conditions in the community to which it is addressed ; and the contents and form are often due to the Apostle's intensely vivid realization of the situation to which he is addressing himself [1].

The above observations are sufficient, we think, to show that Saint Paul's glorious Christ was not a mere phantom of his imagination; on the contrary, the Apostle carefully demonstrates that the preexistent Christ became Incarnate and that He was true man, and traces for us in detail the portrait of the historical Christ. In fact, the teaching concerning Christ's humanity plays an important role in the Pauline doctrine of salvation. For in the actual economy Christ in order to fulfil His mission must be Second Adam and " first-born from among the dead ". Just as the Fall took place according to the law of solidarity so also the Redemption ; in order to make us sons of God it was fitting that Christ assume our nature and become son of man. If Christ were not true man, neither would He be our Representative and Head.

Art. IV. — JESUS CHRIST HEAD OF THE NEW HUMANITY.

As Incarnate Word Christ is at once the Messias, the Mediator, the New Adam, and the Redeemer. Between these different

1. Thus the Epistles to the Thessalonians were principally evoked by the necessity on the part of Saint Paul to quiet the apprehensions of his converts in regard to certain points of his eschatological teaching. Again, the question of legal observances, though settled by the compromise at Jerusalem and by the triumph of Saint Paul's principles at Antioch, continued for a long time to harass the primitive Church. The Apostle in showing the difficulties arising out of the problem left us the great epistles. At the same time there arose in the Church certain theological and practical doubts, on different points of the catechesis. The first Epistle to the Corinthians gives us an idea of the many cases of conscience which the Apostle was called upon to solve. Some time after this the purity of the gospel began to be threatened by coming into contact with profane science, philosophy, and oriental theosophy. The Person and mission of Christ now became the main issue. In his Epistles of the Captivity Saint Paul answers and satisfies the questions of his converts, and explains the role of Christ in the order of salvation. Finally, aware that he had " finished his course ", and that the " time of his dissolution " was at hand, Saint Paul began to feel the need of organizing his churches and guarding them against false and strange doctrines. Hence in the Pastorals his main concern is to solidify the government of the Church and to exhort his followers to " guard the deposit ".

ways of representing Jesus Christ there is, we think, only a formal difference. Thus the Messias is the restorer of God's kingdom, and His role extends not only to Israel according to the flesh but to all spiritual descendants of Abraham who are called to form a part of His Church. However, this universal restoration and reconciliation of all man in the one mystic body is possible only because Christ is perfect Mediator in both the ontological and moral orders. Again, Christ's mediation is universal and has a value for all men only because Christ has become a member of the human family, because He is Chief of mankind, i. e., the New Adam. However Christ does not become effectively Second Adam, He is not actually incorporated into humanity and humanity into Him save by His redeeming work on Calvary and at the sepulchre. A brief exposé will render clearer the various ideas which these titles connote.

I. The Son of God is called υἱός τῆς ἀγάπης αὐτοῦ (Col. I, 13), a title, which like ἀγαπητός and ἠγαπημένος had probably a Messianic signification and a value equivalent to μονογενής [1]. So too the term πρωτότοκος (Col. I, 15) seems to have been a recognized title of the Messias (cf. Heb. I, 6) [2]. Before His earthly appearance the Messias preexisted as Son of God (Rom. VIII, 3 ; Gal. IV, 4) ; preexisting ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ and as equal to God (ἴσα θεῷ) (Phil. II, 5 ff.), He already at that time played a role in the history of Israel (I Cor. X, 4). When the fulness of the time came He was sent by the Father from the midst of His heavenly glories upon earth (II Cor. VIII, 9 ; Gal. IV, 4),

1. The title, υἱός τῆς ἀγάπης αὐτοῦ, is probably equivalent to ἀγαπητός and ἠγαπημένος (cf. Mk. XII, 6). The term ἀγαπητός when associated with υἱὸς or παῖς frequently = μονογενής In profane Greek cf. *Il.*, VI, 401, *Od.*, IV, 817 ; DEM., 567, 24 ; in the LXX cf. Gen. XXII, 2 (LXX = ἀγαπητός AQUILA = μονογενής), XXII, 12, 16 ; Jer. VI, 26 ; Zach. XII, 10 ; Prov. IV, 3 (LXX = ἀγαμώμενος ; ; AQUILA = μονογενής). In the Synoptics ἀγαπητός is used in the same sense as μονογενής by St. John. Cf. Mk. I, 11 ; Lk. III, 22 ; Mt. III, 17 ; Mk. IX, 7 ; Mt. XVII, 5 ; Lk. IX, 35 ; II Peter I, 17 ; Eph. I, 6 ; Rom. VIII, 32.

2. The term πρωτότοκος seems to have been a recognized title of the Messias, derived perhaps from Ps. LXXXIX, 28, ἐγὼ πρωτότοκον θήσομαι αὐτὸν κ. τ. λ.; the latter was interpreted of the Messias by R. Nathan in *Shemoth Rabba*, 19, fol. 118, 4. The way for this Messianic reference of πρωτότοκος had been paved by its prior application to the Israelites, the prerogative race, cf. Jer. XXXI, 9 : " Ephraim is my first-born " ; Exod. IV, 22 : " Israel is my son, my first-born ". Cf. also Psalm. Salom. XVIII, 4 ἡ παιδεία σου ἐφ' ἡμᾶς ὡς υἱὸν πρωτότοκον μονογενῆ, and IV Esdr. VI, 58 : " nos populus tuus, quem vocasti primogenitum, unigenitum ". Cf. Gal. III, 16.

in order to redeem the Jews from the tyranny of the Law and to confer upon both Jews and Gentiles the adoptive filiation.

The earthly Christ is not only man, but also a Jew, born of a woman, born under the Law, and a Israelite by origin (Gal. IV, 4 ; Rom. IX, 5). He is a descendant of Abraham and the true heir of the promises, for " to Abraham were the promises made and to his seed, i. e., Christ " (Gal. III, 16) [1]. He is chief of the kingdom, the Son of David (Col. I, 13 ; Rom. I, 3 ; II Tim. II, 8). The Apostle's conviction of Christ's Davidic descent is not the result of genealogical researchs but rather an echo of the primitive tradition and an expression of Saint Paul's Messianic faith. Jesus is clearly therefore in the eyes of Saint Paul the promised Messias ; in fact, one can say that it is this characteristic that the Apostle attributes to Him when he calls Him the " Christ ".

The Messianic role of Christ is not restricted merely to Israel according to the flesh, but all true descendants of Abraham are called to form a part of His mystic body. Henceforth " there is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female. But all are one in Christ Jesus " as the true posterity of Abraham and heirs according to the promise (Gal. III, 28, 29 ; Rom. III, 29, 30, IV, 9). The Church which is the body of Christ, and which is informed and lives by His Spirit, is aptly called Abraham's *seed*, i. e., the *mystic Christ* (Gal. III, 16). Christ is thus Messias not only for the Jews but for whole humanity, nay, even for whole creation. His role as liberator acquires a cosmic importance. He will triumph completely over His enemies on the great day of judgment when He will return on the clouds of heaven to inaugurate

1. The thought in Gal. III, 16 is clearly stated by CORNELY, *Epistolae ad Corinthios altera et ad Galatas*, p. 496 : " Abrahae dictae sunt promissiones et posteris ejus, neque tamen his, quatenus multi sunt singulique inter se disiuncti nullo vinculo colligantur, sed quatenus omnes coniuncti unum corpus constituunt ; nam si eis, quatenus multi et disiuncti sunt, promissiones essent datae, Deus non nomen *seminis* elegisset, quo unitas quaedam connotatur, sed aliud nomen (τέκνα, ἀπόγονοι, filii, posteri etc), quo pluralitas clare effertur. Divinitus igitur provisum esse Apostolus censet, ut in promissione nomine collectivo singulari adhibito unitas enuntiaretur ; namque hac ratione cautum est, ut filii Israel sibi eatenus tantum, quatenus *unum* semen Abrahae sunt, jus ad haereditatem patris sui Abrahae attribuant ; similiter etiam sensu typico spiritualis haereditas posteris Abrahae spiritualibus non est promissa, quatenus multi sunt variisque rationibus inter se distincti, sed quatenus omnes simul sunt *unum* semen Abrahae ".

the solemn final phase of the kingdom (I Thess. I, 10, II, 12, IV, 16 ; II Thess. I, 7, II, 8 ; I Cor. XV, 24 ; II Cor. V, 10 ; Eph. V, 5).

II. If Christ exercises His mission effectively it is because He is a mandatory of God and a representative of men, i. e. a mediator. In Him all the characteristics of a mediator are most fully verified : in the physical order He binds together, by the hypostatic union of two natures, the Divinity and the humanity ; this union however exists only in view of the efficacious reconciliation of sinful man with an offended God. The Apostle pregnantly sums up the natural and moral mediation of Christ in I Tim. II, 5 : " For there is one God, and one mediator of God and men, the man Jesus Christ, who gave himself a redemption for all ". Similarly in Col. I, 19 f. Saint Paul says : " In him it hath well pleased the Father that all fulness should dwell, and through him to reconcile all things unto himself, making peace through the blood of his cross, both as to the things that are on earth, and the things that are in heaven " ; here again the universal and unique moral mediation of Christ is based upon His ontological mediatorship, and concides with Christ's primacy in the Church. The Pauline soteriology turns as it were on the pivotal concept of the mediatorship of Christ : " God indeed was in Christ reconciling the world to himself " (II Cor. V, 19) [1].

Hence while the Redemption is the work of God because God is the author of Christ and because the Redeemer is one of the

1. The notion of " mediator " is thus explained by HUGON, *De Verbo Incarnato et hominum Redemptore*, pp. 379-381 : " Dicitur *mediator* qui medius stat inter duos vel plures a se distinctos, ut illos conjungat. Quapropter, ut quis sit mediator, debet habere aliquid commune cum utraque parte conjungenda vel concilianda, naturam scilicet, aut amicitiam, aut aliquid hujusmodi, vi cujus utrumque extremum conjungat. Id quod est commune est fundamentum mediationis, officium autem seu proprium munus mediatoris consistit in *actu* conjungendi aut conciliandi. Distingui potest mediatio mere ontologica, secundum naturam et in esse entis, ac mediatio *moralis*, quae reconciliationem inter duo praesertim importat. Mediator quidem proprie dictus est qui reconciliat diversas partes, *satisfactionem perfectam* reddendo parti laesae ; mediator autem secundum quid ille qui conciliat quin tamen satisfaciat. Hinc *mediator* plus dicit quam *medius:* ut enim quis censeatur medius, sufficit mediatio ontologica ; ut vero quis sit proprie mediator requiritur mediatio moralis cum satisfactione ..... Christus isque solus inimicitiam nostram cum Deo abstulit et *plene* pro nobis satisfacit Deo ". Cf. also by the same author *Le mystère de la rédemption*[3], pp. 161 ff., 242 ff., and MICHEL, art. *Jésus Christ*, DTC, vol. VIII, col. 1345-1347.

Three Persons of the Holy Trinity, it is by His human nature, and not directly by His divine nature, that the Word made flesh redeemed us. For if Christ had redeemed us as God, the Incarnation would have been useless, and the Redemption in this hypothesis ought to be attributed in the same way to the Three Persons and not especially to Him Who became Incarnate. By His Incarnation Christ binds together the divinity and humanity in one personal unity, which confers upon all His acts the dignity of being the acts of God and of remaining at the same time the free actions of the man. The acts of the God-man thus belong in an eminent manner to the supernatural order.

Christ's moral mediation began at His conception and was consummated by His passion and death ; it comprises all the actions from the manger to the Cross, and hence Christ's office of Mediator merges into that of Redeemer [1]. Workman, after having " reduced " Christ to a " manifestation of the Father's will and love ", maintains that the object of His " mediatorial mission was not to make God propitious, but to make men penitent, by giving them a true conception of him, and by bringing them into a conscious acquaintance with him " [2]. But far other is the moral mediatorship of Christ as represented by Saint Paul. Through Christ's mediation, says the Apostle, we have redemption (Rom. III, 24 ; Eph. I, 7), reconciliation (Rom. V, 10-11; II Cor. V, 18 ; Eph. II, 16 ; Col. I, 20-22), peace (Rom. V, 1), and assured refuge against wrath (Rom. V, 9 ; Eph. II, 18) ; through Him also we have grace (Rom. I, 5, V, 21), justification (Rom. V, 18 ; Gal. II, 16), adoptive filiation (Eph. I, 5), and victory over all our enemies (Rom. VIII, 37 ; I Cor. XV, 57). The view of Workman, in fact, is really equivalent to a denial of the objective value of Christ's redeeming work.

1. The relation of Christ's life to His Death in regard to the Redemption is thus stated by Billot, *De Verbo Incarnato*, p. 450 : " Omnia quae Christus in hoc mundo libere egit et passus est per *modum unius* consideranda sint, sic tamen ut mors crucis habeatur tamquam principale ". So too Rivière, *Le dogme de la rédemption*, pp. 188-189 : " Quant à la théologie catholique, elle n'a jamais isolé la vie et la mort du Sauveur comme des quantités de valeur différente ; lorsque on parle de la mort sur la croix comme source de notre salut, c'est une expression raccourcie, dans laquelle on sous-entend que ce suprême sacrifice du Sauveur se relie à ceux de sa vie tout entière dont il constitue le terme et l'apogée ". Cf. also Hugon, *Le mystère de la rédemption*[3], pp. 215-216.

2. *At Onement or Reconciliation with God*, pp. 78, 73.

III. A mediator in the usual sense of the word is not one of the two parties who are at variance and between whom he intervenes. But it is otherwise with Christ " in whom dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead corporeally " (Col. II, 9), and Who has really become a member of the human family. He is not an ordinary mediator, but He is also " Second Adam ", a title, which the Apostle expressly creates for Him and which eminently contains that of mediator. By the Incarnation Christ became one of us ; and it is because of this solidarity of Christ with the race that His life and death have the character of satisfaction for the sins of men. For if satisfaction as merit regularly has an efficacy restricted to the person who is its author, the, as it were, universal character of Christ's Person extends the influence of His actions to our whole race. By its Head and in union with Him mankind in spite of its sins enters into grace before God and receives the pardon of sins. Christ became what we are in order to make us what He is. The Son of God, consubstantial with the Father, became man to render us, by His participation of human nature, participants of the divine nature and of immortality.

From the above we can see what intimate relation exists between the Incarnation and the Redemption. It is because the Son of God became Incarnate and because He became one of us that He is able to save us by His mediation. By going back to its source we may consider our salvation and restoration as already accomplished by the Incarnation (cf. Rom. VIII, 3). This is the view point generally adopted by the Greek Fathers. The latter, however, did not consider the union of our nature with the divine as consisting in the Incarnation considered merely in an abstract manner ; they did not separate the Incarnation from Christ's life among men, from His doctrine and example, and from His passion and death. In fact, since the Incarnation is the necessary foundation of Christ's solidarity with men and of the Redemption, this view-point is entirely justified ; the death of Christ is then considered not as an isolated but as the culminating point of His career.

The idea of Christ's solidarity with mankind runs throughout the Apostle's soteriological doctrine : it is found in those passages where Saint Paul says that Christ became a member of the human race in order to espouse its cause and represent its interests, in those texts where he teaches the intimate union

of Christ with His community in His Death and Resurrection, and in his doctrine concerning our incorporation into Christ. No doubt when Saint Paul reflected in the light of divine revelation on the series of stupendous events of which Christ was the cause, when he pondered over the immeasurable differences which His brief presence made in the life of mankind, there inevitably took place in his mind a grand antithesis between the first and the last head of mankind, between the author of sin and death and the author of justice and life.

It is this idea of Christ's solidarity with humanity, we think, that the Apostle wishes to teach in Gal. III, 13 : " Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us, for it is written : Cursed is everyone that hangeth on a tree " [1] There is perhaps no passage in the Pauline Epistles which has been the object of so many diverse interpretations ; it was on the basis of this text that Lutheran theologians of the Reformation maintained that Christ in His Death became a malediction from the Father in the real sense of the word. To us it seems that the passage denotes primarily Christ's solidarity with those whom He came to redeem. For if Christ became man in order to save men, was clad in the " likeness of sinful flesh " in order to vanquish the flesh (Rom. VIII, 3), was born under the Law in order to redeem those who were under the Law (Gal. IV, 4), became a member of the sinful family in order to save the guilty (II Cor. V, 21), He also took upon Himself the malediction of the Law in order to be in a fit position to deliver the Jews from the curse of the Law. His being " made a curse for us " denotes the fact that Christ though innocent placed Himself in a state which the Law declares cursed. For the Apostle tells us that all those who depend on works of the Law and place their confidence exclusively in them are under malediction (Gal. III, 10). In fact, the Law curses all men because it does not give the strength and energy for the fulfilment of what it commands. Hence as a necessary condition of redeeming the Jews from the yoke of the Law, Christ makes Himself a participant of their

1. For the common interpretation of the text cf. MACKINTOSH, *Historic Theories of the Atonement*, pp. 66-67, WESTCOTT, *St. Paul and Justification*, pp. 54-55, WORKMAN, *At Onement or Reconciliation with God*, p. 64, FEINE, *Theologie des neuen Testaments*[3], p. 249, ROSTRON, *The Christology of St. Paul* pp. 87-88, B. WEISS, *Biblical Theology of the New Testament* (E. T.), vol. I, p. 424 ff.

malediction that " the blessings of Abraham might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ, that we may receive the promise of the Spirit by faith " (Gal. III, 14) [1].

An idea similar to the above is enunciated in II Cor. V, 21 : " Him who knew no sin, he hath made sin for us, that we might be made the justice of God in him " [2]. Jesus Christ, the Head of the human race whose cause He espouses and whose interests He embraces, becomes neither a sinner nor sin personally save in so far as He is a member of the sinful family to which He is united. And He thus assumes our nature and enters into our lot ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, in order to make us justice of God in Him. If union with men could not render Jesus a sinner since He was impeccable (τὸν μὴ γνόντα ἁμαρτίαν), our union, however, with Him Who is justice itself make us participants of His justice.

In the texts mentioned above, neither in Gal. III, 13, where he says that " Christ being made a curse for us hath redeemed us from the curse of the law ", nor again in Gal. IV, 4 where he tells us that the Son of God was " made under the law that he might redeem them who were under the law ", nor finally in II Cor. V, 21 where he writes that God made Christ " sin for us that we might be made the justice of God in Him " (cf. Rom. VIII, 3) does Saint Paul tell us how *de facto* this redemption was realized or how actually we were made " justice of God in Him ". Without stopping at the intermediate and all important stage of Christ's sacrificial Death he seems to attribute directly to solidarity the effects of the former. Because Christ has become *solidaire* with mankind, we are said to have received the blessings of Abraham, the " promise of the Spirit ", adoptive filiation, and reconciliation. But we must not seek the *ensemble* of the Apostle's doctrine in every text Solidarity points to the redemptive Death and underlies it as an essential condition. It is because Christ is considered as the Head of the human race that His Death, whereby He became a victim for sin, is of value for His whole community, the latter being considered as dying with its Chief ; it is for this reason also that we are

---

1. Cf. PRAT, o. c., vol. II[6], p. 245 ff., BURTON, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians*, pp. 172-175.

2. Cf. GARVIE, *Studies of Paul and His Gospel*, p. 163, FORSYTH, *The Cruciality of the Cross*, p. 212.

made " justice of God in Him ", juridically on Calvary, and effectively by the participation of His Spirit.

This solidarity of Christ with the race in His death is expressed in II Cor. v, 14-15 : " For the charity of Christ presseth us, judging this, that if one died for all, then all were dead (ὅτι εἷς ὑπὲρ πάντων ἀπέθανον ἄρα οἱ πάντες ἀπέθανον). And Christ died for all that they also who live may not now live to themselves, but unto him who died and rose for them ". The Apostle concludes then that if one died for all, we all died mystically with Him. While it is true that we are associated with the dying Christ only in a mystic manner in so far as His death was morally the death of the human race of which He was the Head, yet this death is effectively realized in us by faith and baptism. Elsewhere the Apostle says: " As in Adam all die, so also in Christ all shall be made alive " (I Cor. xv, 22), i.e., just as in Adam all die potentially in the very act of transgression and then actually by the fact of natural generation, so also all are vivified in Christ, juridically on Calvary, and effectively by our incorporation into the mystic Christ by baptism. Hence the Apostle considers that he no longer belongs to himself but to Jesus Christ and to his brethren, because, firstly, he died a mystic death with Christ on the Cross, and secondly, because this mystic death implies and demands a moral death to himself and to his egoism (Gal. II, 20, cf. VI, 14 ; Rom. VI, 1-11 ; Col. II, 20, III, 3) [1].

The idea of solidarity then lies at the basis of the Apostle's teaching concerning the vicarious redeeming work of Christ : Christ gives satisfaction in *our* place, expiates *our* sins, and offers His Death as a substitution in *our* behalf. Having identified Himself with the dolorous consequences of sin, when He, the Head, suffers, all men suffer in His Person, are dispensed from suffering in their own members, and have their sins remitted. If therefore the acts and merits of Christ have a value for His community, it is because He is the Chief and Head of mankind, it is because He and His spiritual humanity form, as it were, one body and one being with Him.

---

1. According to RIVIÈRE, art. *Le premier théologien de la rédemption*, RCF, 1913, vol. 73, pp. 34-37, the phrase ἄρα οἱ πάντες ἀπέθανον of II Cor. v, 14 refers to original sin ; for a consideration of this view cf. PRAT, o. c., vol. II[6], p. 241 ff., VAN STEENKISTE, *Commentarius in s. Pauli epistolas*[6], vol. I, p. 450 f.

But if this be true, do not the conceptions of solidarity and substitution exclude one another, as Foley [1] claims? Are we not obliged to say that by virtue of substitution, Christ, dying in the place of sinners, dispensed them from dying, and, on the contrary, that by virtue of solidarity the whole community of believers, forming one body with Christ, had undergone death at the same time as its Head? In resolving this apparent difficulty we would note that to act or to suffer in the place of another implies three things: first, that this other did not do or endure that to which he was in some way bound, second, that he who takes his place does or endures something similar, and, third, that this action or suffering has an effect in some way identical to that which the action or suffering of him whom he replaces would have had. Coming now to the substitutionary expiation of Christ we find that it is not opposed to solidarity but rather demands it. For it is precisely because Christ is the Head and Chief of mankind that His sufferings and Death have a value for His whole community and that substitution thus retains its full force. The solidarity between Christ and His members, though very real, is mystic: the Head alone undergoes physically the penalty of death, while His community undergoes it mystically.

The same principle of solidarity underlies the Apostle's doctrine concerning the Resurrection. In His Resurrection as in His Death Christ is for Saint Paul the Head and Representative of the race: we all rise with Him and come forth from the sepulchre to lead a new life. The triumph of Christ over sin and death is thus not a purely individual and personal triumph of which the Son of God had no need, but it is a collective triumph of the whole mystic body of which Christ is the Head. "If we believe that Jesus died and rose again", says the Apostle, "even so them who have slept through Jesus, will God bring with him" (I Thess. IV, 14). Writing to the Corinthians, the Apostle demonstrates to them that the Resurrection of Christ not only implies the possibility of but *de facto* involves the resurrection of the dead (I Cor. XV, 1-34); the Risen Christ is "the firstfruits of them that sleep, for by a man came death, and by a man the resurrection of the dead, and as in Adam all die, so also in Christ all shall be made alive" (I Cor. XV, 20-22;

1. *Anselm's Theory of the Atonement*, pp. 69, 73.

cf. Rom. v, 15, vi, 5-8 ; Eph. ii, 5 ; Col. iii, 4). Just as the Apostle said, " if one died for all then all died " (II Cor. v, 14), he could also have written, " if one is risen for all, then all have risen " ; in fact, this thought seems to be present in the Apostle's mind when in II Cor. v, 15 he continues : " And he died for all, that they also who live may not now live to themselves but unto him who died and rose for them (τῷ ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν ἀποθανόντι καὶ ἐγερθέντι). The same solidarity between the new life of Christ and that of the faithful is again affirmed in Col. i, 1-3 : " If you be risen with Christ, seek the things that are above, where Christ is sitting at the right hand of God..... For you are dead and your life is hid with Christ in God ".

These events take place *en droit* on Calvary and at the sepulchre, really and effectively in baptism. Now baptism is not only a symbol and a rite, but also a sacrament operating what it signifies. It not only represents the assimilation of the Christian to Christ's Death and Resurrection but also realizes it. It is described as a baptism εἰς Χριστὸν (Gal. iii, 27 ; Rom. vi, 3), as a baptism εἰς τὸ ὄνομα Χριστοῦ (I Cor. i, 13-17), and as a " putting on of Christ " (Rom. xiii, 14 ; Gal. iii, 27). By it the Christian is effectively united to Christ, enters into a participation of His Spirit, and becomes a member of the mystic body, i. e. the Church, of which Christ is the Head. Being thus united to Christ, he is reconciled with God, justified, and delivered *en principe* from death. He is regenerated by the Spirit of Christ and is no longer under the tyrannical dominion of sin. In a word, he enters into full possession of the blessings of the new era.

From the above it is evident that the idea of solidarity holds a fundamental position in the soteriological teaching of Saint Paul. This same idea of solidarity is again brought out by the contrast which the Apostle establishes between the Second and the first Adam [1]. Thus Saint Paul says : " The first man

1. (a) It has heretofore been assumed by nearly all exegetes that Saint Paul in describing Christ as the Second Adam was using a common Rabbinic title for the Messias. Thus SANDAY, *Epistle to the Romans*[5], p. 136, speaks of " the Rabbinical designation of the Messiah as ὁ δεύτερος or ὁ ἔσχατος Ἀδαμ ". Cf. also ROSTRON, *The Christology of St. Paul*, p. 57 ff. But it has recently been shown that this assumption rests on a very slender foundation. Cf. THACKERAY, *The Relation of St. Paul to Contemporary Jewish Thought*, p. 40 ff. The ordinary interpretation is based on certain mediaeval passages, which were influenced by the Kabala, the most striking of which occurs in the *Neve Schalom*, IX, 8: האדם האחרון הוא המשיח, " the last Adam (or man)

Adam was made into a living soul ; the last Adam into a quickening spirit " (ἐγένετο ὁ πρῶτος ἄνθρωπος Ἀδὰμ εἰς ψυχὴν ζῶσαν. ὁ ἔσχατος Ἀδαμ εἰς πνεῦμα ζωοποιοῦν) (I Cor. XV, 45), and again, " The first man was of the earth earthy, the second man, from heaven, heavenly " (ὁ πρῶτος ἄνθρωπος ἐκ γῆς χοϊκος, ὁ δεύτερος ἄνθρωπος ἐξ οὐρανοῦ) (I Cor. XV, 47). The first Adam whose body was ἐκ γῆς and χοϊκος became, according to Gen. II, 7, a " living soul " ; his body was a natural one, being under the control of the ψυχή. Hence he could not

---

is the Messias ". But these expressions are to be considered as unconscious Christian infiltrations, for it has been shown that the *Neve Schalom* is the work of a Spanish Jew of the latter part of the fifteenth century. The expression, אדם הראשון, was very common, however, in Saint Paul's time, but it merely denotes Adam, the first man, in opposition to all later men and implies no contrast. The corresponding phrase, " Second Adam ", is, according to scholars of Rabbinic literature, absent from the whole range of early and mediaeval writings up to the *Neve Schalom*. Hence we have no evidence that Saint Paul owed the expression to his Rabbinic training. But it is otherwise with the *idea* of an antithesis between Adam and the Messias, which occurs in the earliest midrash on Genesis, *Bereschith Rabba*, 12, in the sixth century.

(b) But can the genesis of Saint Paul's teaching concerning the Second Adam be found perhaps in Alexandrian thought ? HOLTZMANN, *Lehrbuch der neutestamentlichen Theologie*[2], p. 101, alleges that we have here a combination of Philo's doctrine with the doctrine of the preexistence of the Messias, so that " Second Adam " designates the " preexistent heavenly man " *(Himmelsmensch)*. Philo, we know, had noticed the two accounts of man's creation in Gen. I, 26-27 and II, 7, and based on them a doctrine, in which Platonism played a part, of a heavenly and earthly man, the former or archetypal man being first created in the image of God. Elsewhere he interprets the εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ to mean the λόγος, so that when man is said to have been created after the image of God the meaning is that the archetypal man was created in the likeness of the λόγος. The two passages where Philo expounds this doctrine are the following :

1) *De leg. alleg.*, I, 12, 13 : Διττὰ ἀνθρώπων γένη. ὁ μὲν γὰρ ἐστιν οὐράνιος ἄνθρωπος, ὁ δὲ γήϊνος. Ὁ μὲν οὖν οὐράνιος ἅτε κατ' εἰκόνα θεοῦ γεγονὼς φθαρτῆς καὶ συνόλως γεώδους οὐσίας ἀμέτοχος. ὁ δὲ γήϊνος ἐκ σποράδος ὕλης, ἣν χοῦν κέκληκεν ἐπάγη. Διὸ τὸν μὲν οὐράνιόν φησιν οὐ πέπλασθαι, κατ' εἰκόνα δὲ τετυπῶσθαι θεοῦ. τὸν δὲ γήϊνον πλάσμα ἀλλ' οὐ γέννημα εἶναι τοῦ τεχνιτοῦ.

2) *De mund. opif.* 46 : Ἐναργέστατα καὶ διὰ τούτο [Gen. II, 7] παρίστησιν ὅτι διαφορὰ παμμεγέθης ἐστι τοῦ τε νῦν πλασθέντος ἀνθρώπου καὶ τοῦ κατὰ τὴν εἰκόνα θεοῦ γεγονότος πρότερον. Ὁ μὲν γὰρ διαπλασθεὶς αἰσθητὸς ἤδη μετέχων ποιότητος, ἐκ σώματος καὶ ψυχῆς συνεστώς, ἀνὴρ ἢ γυνή, φυσει θνητός ὁ δὲ κατὰ τὴν εἰκόνα, ἰδέα τις ἢ γένος ἢ σφραγίς, νοητός, ἀσώματος, οὔτ' ἄρρεν οὔτε θῆλυ, ἀφθαρτος φύσει. τοῦ δὲ αἰσθητοῦ καὶ ἐπί μέρους ἀνθρώπου τὴν κατασκευὴν σύνθετον εἶναί φησιν ἐκ τε γεώδους οὐσίας καὶ πνεύματος θείου κ. τ. λ.

Is there any connection to be traced between this Philonic idea and the Pauline distinction between the first man who is of the earth and the second man who is from heaven ? We do not think so. For the order in Saint Paul (I Cor. XV, 45 ff.) is the reverse of that in Philo : first the earthly, then the heavenly. Again there is nothing to show that Saint Paul has in mind the two accounts of creation ; his language seems to be suggested wholly by

transmit to his descendants anything except that which he possessed, namely, a psychical and mortal body. Having lost the supernatural and preternatural gifts which formerly were a part of his heritage, earthly, he gives birth only to earthly men. But far different is the nature of the Second Adam : He is ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, not only because He was divinely preexistent (cf Rom. VIII, 3 ; Gal. IV, 4) but especially because He is the glorified Chief of redeemed humanity and the Principle of supernatural life. For at the moment of the Resurrection He received the glory and assumed the spiritual body to which He had a a right both because of the plenitude of the Holy Spirit which He possessed since His miraculous conception and because of the merits of His redeeming work. It was then also that

---

Gen. II, 7. The passage of Gen. I, 27 is applied to Adam in I Cor. XI, 7, but here there is no question of the Philonic idea. Furthermore, it is very doubtful whether the real preexistence of the Messias was at this time a widely prevalent doctrine among the Jews, or whether Philo's speculation had already in Saint Paul's time influenced Rabbinic theology. Finally although ἐξ οὐρανοῦ refers to the preexistence of Christ, that reference does not exhaust the meaning of the words. Cf. BACHMANN, *Der erste Brief des Paulus an die Korinther*², pp. 462-463 n.

(c) WOODS, *The Gospel of Rightness*, p. 31 ff., " assumes " that the Apostle uses the allegorical method in regard to the Adam narratives, and thinks that I Cor. XV, 45 " may have " referred to a portion of the written Cabala. Now according to the Cabala, he tells us, the first two chapters of Genesis set forth the creation of " Adam " as an evolutionary process of which four definite stages may be noted : 1) when the primitive tradition tells us that Adam fell, this implies of necessity that he was once " unfallen ". In this state he is, the divine prototype of man, the Logos, the First Adam or Adam Kadmon the " God " of Gen. I. He is collectively the three highest groups of the ten Sephira or Elohim. He (or they) bestows the Ruach or Spirit in man. 2) From these come the creative Elohim, or lower seven Sephira (the " Second Adam ", the " Divine Hermaphrodite "), Lords of creation and of man, who bestows on him the Nephesh, and fashen his body from the " dust ". They are the " Lord God " of Gen. II. 3) Adam made of the dust of the ground is the product and embodiment of the Creative Elohim. Like his prototypes, Adam in this stage is androgyne. 4) The last stage is reached when the separated man and woman emerge after the deep sleep of the androgyne Adam (Gen. II, 23), sex-separation being the precursor of that earthly birth which follows as a consequence of the mystic transgression.

What is to be said of this theory ? A complete refutation would require a study of the origin and development of the Cabala, yet we feel that it is not necessary to do so to show that Saint Paul could never have been a partisan of such monstrosities as indicated above. A stern Pharisee with his conception of a unique Holy God, Creator and Preserver of the Universe, would never have accepted the gross anthropomorphisms, the gnostic emanations and pantheism of the Cabalists. Moreover, the author himself surrounds his view with so many assumptions and is so conscious of its many discrepancies with Saint Paul's narrative that his theory at best resolves itself into fanciful imagination.

He became a πνεῦμα ζωοποιοῦν (I Cor. xv, 45), capable of communicating to those united to Him the supernatural life with which He Himself is endowed. Hence while the first Adam bequeathed death to all who descend from him by carnal generation, the Second Adam confers life on all who are united to Him by supernatural regeneration : " by a man came death, and by a man the resurrection of the dead, and as in Adam all die, so also in Christ all shall be made alive " (ζωοποιηθήσονται) (I Cor. xv, 21-22). Hence also the Apostle admonishes us : " As we have born the image of the earthly (τὴν εἰκόνα τοῦ χοϊκου), let us bear also the image of the heavenly " (τὴν εἰκόνα τοῦ ἐπουρανίου) (I Cor. xv, 49).

Like the *nature* so too the *work* of the Second Adam is also described with reference to the work of the first Adam. In Rom. v, 12-19 the Apostle tells us that as *one* is the author of justice and life (vv. 15-19) so also *one* is the author of sin and death (vv. 12, 15-19). In comparing the work of the Second and of the first Adam the Apostle indicates first of all a point of resemblance ; each work is effected by a single agent ; while from Adam comes ἁμαρτία, θάνατος, εἰς πάντας, from Christ comes δικαιοσύνη, ζωὴ, εἰς πάντας. But the χάρισμα or fulness of grace whereof Christians partake in Christ does not correspond to the παράπτωμα, Adam's fall, which compromised all his descendants, and hence the Apostle proceeds to note the points of difference [1].

1. The ideas contained in Rom. v, 15-19 may be rendered clearer by the following disposition of the text :

v. 15 : Ἀλλ' οὐχ ὡς τὸ παράπτωμα, οὕτος καὶ τὸ χάρισμα·
εἰ γὰρ πολλῷ μᾶλλον
τῷ τοῦ ἑνὸς παραπτώματι ἡ χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἡ δωρεα ἐν χάριτι
οἱ πολλοὶ ἀπέθανον. τῇ τοῦ ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου Ἰ. Χ.
εἰς τοὺς πολλοὺς ἐπερίσσευσεν.

v. 16 : Καὶ οὐχ ὡς δι' ἑνὸς ἁμαρτήσαντος τὸ δώρημα·
τὸ μὲν γὰρ κρίμα τὸ δὲ χάρισμα
ἐξ ἑνὸς ἐκ πολλῶν παραπτωμάτων
εἰς κατάκριμα. εἰς δικαίωμα.

v. 17 : Εἰ γὰρ πολλῷ μᾶλλον
τῷ τοῦ ἑνὸς παραπτώματι οἱ τὴν περισσείαν τῆς χάριτος καὶ
ὁ θάνατος ἐβασίλευσεν τῆς δωρεᾶς τῆς δικαιοσύνης λαμβάνοντες
διὰ τοῦ ἑνός. ἐν ζωῇ βασιλεύσουσιν
διὰ τοῦ ἑνὸς Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

v. 18 : Ἄρα οὖν ὡς δι' ἑνὸς παρατώματος οὕτως καὶ δι' ἑνὸς δικαιώματος
εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους εἰς πάντας ανθρώπους
εἰς κατάκριμα εἰς δικαίωσιν ζωῆς.

v. 19 : Ὥσπερ γὰρ διὰ τῆς παρακοῆς οὕτως καὶ διὰ τῆς ὑπακοῆς
τοῦ ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου τοῦ ἑνὸς
ἁμαρτολοὶ κατεστάθησαν οἱ πολλοί. δίκαιοι κατασταθήσονται οἱ πολλοί.

The first contrast lies in the nature and measure of their specific effects. If the effect of Adam's παράπτωμα is the death of all men, " much more the grace (χάρις) of God and the gift (δωρεὰ), by the grace of one man, Jesus Christ, hath abounded unto many " (v. 15). A second difference consists in the number and power of the causes which immediately occasioned them : a single agent by a single act caused the Fall ; from one sinner came the occasion of that judicial sentence (κρῖμα), which led on to condemnation (κατάκριμα). But not so with the δώρημα : many falls into sin have moved the Divine Mercy to bestow that great gift of grace in Christ, χάρισμα, which leads on to a δικαίωμα from God the Father (v. 16). The power of the Second Adam therefore, in the direction of salvation, cannot fall short of the power of the first Adam in the direction of destruction. Rather if the one παράπτωμα inaugurated the reign of death, much more will they who receive τὴν περισσείαν τῆς χάριτος and its concrete result τὴν δώρεαν τῆς δικαιοσύνης attain to the reign of life through Jesus Christ (v. 17). In vv. 18-19 the Apostle finally gives a summary recapitulation of the whole parallel (vv. 12-17), comprehending the points of similarity and unlikeness. In v. 18 is found a comparison of the two representative acts and of their ultimate consequence, while in v. 19 we have a comparison of the moral disposition of the two agents and of their immediate consequences.

According to certain theologians as Du Bose [1] Terry [2], and Peake [3], the Apostle in Rom v, 12-19 does not regard Adam as a historical individual but merely idealizes him as the typical sinner. Says Peake[4] : " Adam is typical of the race. ...The act of Adam is crucial just because it is typical ; the nature of Adam is our common nature ; he is the natural man moulded from the dust. The sin latent in us was latent also in him ". There is however no reason to interpret the two members of the parallel, in which it is expressly stated that Adam was " a figure of him who was to come " (v. 14), in two different ways, and against their natural meaning and force ; to do so would be to distort the fundamental view-point of the Apostle whose primary purpose in Rom. v, 12-19 is to show that just

1. *The Gospel according to St. Paul*, pp. 159, 162.
2. *Biblical Dogmatics*, p. 121 ; cf. also pp. 85-86.
3. *The Quintessence of Paulinism*, p. 24.
4. Ibid., p. 24.

as *one* was the author of sin and death for all humanity so also *one* was the author of justice and life. Such an interpretation, moreover, is contrary to the Apostle's statement in I Cor. xv, 21-22, a passage, which may be regarded as a brief summary of Rom. v, 12-19 : " By a man came death, and by a man the resurrection of the dead. And as in Adam all die, so also in Christ all shall be made alive.

The Apostle therefore establishes a close relation between unregenerate humanity and its natural head, Adam, on the one hand, and between the new spiritual humanity and its Head, Jesus Christ, on the other. These relations though unique and inscrutable are yet very vital and real : sinful humanity is conceived as being in some way present and participant in Adam's transgression, and redeemed humanity as being similarly present and participant in Christ's death, burial, and resurrection. Adam is the head of the race in respect to its sinfulness, Christ is the Head of the race in respect to its redemption. The two thus stand in analogous relations to mankind, and it is the aim of the Apostle to show that grace in Christ is mightier than the sin in Adam. How precisely this solidarity between Adam and the race in regard to the transmission of original sin is to be explained, whether Adam was the juridic or moral head of the race, or whether he was the representative of mankind, or whether the explanation is to be sought in the fact that he is the " head and fountain of nature ", are questions which Saint Paul does not explicitly treat[1]. The counterpart of this solidarity, however, namely, the identification of humanity with Christ in His redeeming and sacrificial work, receives more attention in the Pauline Epistles, and in its terms is the former to be explained and understood.

In conclusion, it is evident therefore that the idea of solidarity holds a position of fundamental importance in the soteriological teaching of Saint Paul. Never, in fact, does the Apostle isolate the Christian from Christ, Who is man's Life and All, nor, on the other hand, does he separate the Representative and Head from the rest of humanity. At every stage in the

1. Cf. Billot, *De personali et originali peccato*[5], p. 145 ff., Becker, art. *Zur Frage des Schuldcharacters der Erbsünde*, ZKT, 1924, pp. 59-92.

economy of Redemption, the acts of the Saviour are done in our name and at the same time for our advantage, or, more exactly, they profit us because in a certain way they are accomplished by us in the person of our Head. It is for this reason also that Saint Paul insists so much on the human nature of Christ. The law of solidarity determines primarily the Redeemer's relation towards us and not His relation towards God. It now remains for us to inquire in what and and why Christ became *solidaire* with us, in what and how we benefit from His intervention, in a word, how He repaired the disorder of sin.

CHAPTER II.

The Redeeming Work of Christ.

In the redeeming work of Christ the Apostle distinguishes two events to which from the very beginning of his missionary preaching he attributes a special salvific importance, namely, the Death and Resurrection. Already in his first Epistle to the Thessalonians he speaks of the " purchase of salvation by our Lord Jesus Christ, who died for us, that, whether we watch or sleep, we may live together with him " (v, 10). His oral preaching before the Galatians consisted in depicting before the eyes of his auditors the image of the Crucified, and he affirms in the most categorical manner that " if justice be by the law, then Christ died in vain " (II, 21 ; cf. V, 11, VI, 14). The instrument of this Death is often put by metonymy for the Death itself, and salvation is then said to be by the Cross. " The word of the Cross " (I Cor. I, 18) accordingly forms the substance of the Apostle's message ; he will glory only in the Cross (Gal. VI, 14), and will have but one object of knowledge and interest, — " Jesus Christ and Him crucified " (I Cor. II, 2). It is this doctrine of Christ's death for sin which is " the power of God " (I Cor. I, 18), although to the Jew, who looked for salvation through some outward demonstration of divine power, and to the Greek, who sought the way of life in acute speculations, it appeared to be without meaning or value [1].

1. The important role attributed to the Death of Christ in the Pauline soteriology is not the fruit of posterior theological speculation. This truth formed part of the first Christian symbols, and the Apostle explicitly presents it as an element of the primitive catechesis (I Cor. xv, 3). Nor was Saint Paul obliged at any time directly to combat adversaries who called into doubt the salutary value of the Death of Christ. If the Judaizers of Galatia, who maintained the economy of the Law along with the Cross of Christ, came in reality to destroy the role of the latter, this was in the Apostle's mind a logical consequence of their procedure and not a result sought or desired. The very fact that the Apostle considers himself to have refuted them effectively by bringing this consequence to light shows how profound in the minds of the Christians was the conviction of the efficacy of Christ's Death. The theory that the Apostle's views concerning the redeeming Death of Christ are in

The Resurrection likewise receives similar emphasis in the Pauline Epistles. It is mentioned already in the first Epistle to the Thessalonians together with the redeeming Death (1, 10), and like the latter formed a part of the primitive catechesis : " He rose again the third day, according to the Scriptures " (I Cor. XV, 4). The importance of the Resurrection for salvation is again evident from the following text : " If there be no resurrection of the dead, then Christ is not risen again. And if Christ be not risen again, then is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain. Yea, and we are found false witnesses of God, because we have given testimony against God, that he hath raised up Christ ; whom he hath not raised up, if the dead rise not again. And if Christ be not risen again, your faith is vain, for you are yet in your sins. Then they also who are fallen asleep in Christ, are perished. If in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable. But now Christ is risen from the dead, the firstfruits of them that sleep. For by a man came death, and by a man the resurrection of the dead, and as in Adam all die, so also in Christ all shall be made alive " (I Cor. XV, 13-22).

From these general considerations let us now pass to study more in detail how precisely the Death and Resurrection of the Redeemer brought about our salvation.

---

fundamental opposition to those of Christ and of the other apostles has been severely judged by many Protestant scholars ; says HARNACK, *Das Wesen des Christentums*, p. 97 : " Es gehört zu den sichersten geschichtlichen Thatsachen, dasz nicht etwa erst der Apostel Paulus die Bedeutung des Todes Christi und die Bedeutung seiner Auferstehung so in denVorde rgrund geschoben, sondern dasz er mit dieser Anerkennung ganz auf dem Boden der Urgemeinde gestanden hat " ; so too SABATIER, *L'Apôtre Paul*[4], p. 286 : " Il ne faut point se lasser de le redire, parce qu'on ne cesse de l'oublier : Paul était apôtre avant d'être théologien. Le besoin de conserver était chez lui plus impérieux que celui d'innover. Son évangile était avant tout un message qu'il avait reçu, qu'il devait transmettre, et qu'il devait défendre. Il prêche non seulement avec autorité mais d'autorité " ; similarly FEINE *Theologie des neuen Testaments*[3], p. 184 : " Zum sichersten, was wir über das Verständnis des Todes Jesu in der Urgemeinde wissen gehört die Tatsache dasz auch sie die Lehre von der sühnenden Bedeutung des Todes Jesu gehabt hat. Immer wieder werden Abschwächungen dieser der modernen Theologie sehr unbequemen Tatsache versucht, und doch steht sie da wie ein eherner Fels, an dem alle Versuche der Abschwächung oder Umdeutung wirkungslos abprallen werden. Es ist das prachtvolle Zeugnis des Paulus : " Ich habe euch überliefert, etc." (I Cor. XV, 3). Cf. D'ALÈS, art. *Rédemption*, DApFC, fasc. XX, col. 541-582, VAN CROMBRUGGHE, *De soteriologiae christianae primis fontibus, passim*, TONER, art. *The Soteriological Teaching of Christ*, IThQ, 1907, pp. 89-109.

Art. I. — CHRIST'S REDEEMING DEATH.

I. CONSTITUTIVE ELEMENTS OF THE REDEEMING DEATH OF CHRIST.

As in the Fall the offense against God is the aspect of primary importance and the cause of all the other evils, so also in the work of Redemption the phase which must first occupy our attention is the reparation of the injury to the Most High. For two elements enter into the notion of sin : an interior disorder *(reatus culpae)*, which constitutes the fault, and implies in some way a diminution of the divine honor because the order whereby we should tend to God as our Supreme Good and Last End has been disrupted, and secondly, an exterior disorder *(reatus poenae)*, which is an obligation to undergo a penalty [1]. These two elements do not exclude but imply one another. According to Saint Paul sin is not expiated by the mere fact that its penalty is materially endured ; for if sin incurred a punishment it was because it is an offense against God, a disregard of His Will, and a revolt against His law. Hence God, in order to be reconciled to humanity, demands that sin be repaired in its formality as offense and disobedience. If the death of Christ, therefore, had an expiatory and redeeming value, this was due to the fact that it was not a mere material endurance of pain but also, at the same time, a personal act of sublime love, of obedience, and of total oblation to God.

1. This idea is clearly stated by Medebielle, *L'expiation dans l'Ancien et le Nouveau Testament*, vol. I, p. 6 : " Le péché est en premier lieu et avant tout une injure faite à Dieu ; il est ensuite, par rapport à l'homme, un acte qui mérite châtiment. Ce dernier élément, quoique nécessairement impliqué dans la notion de péché, est secondaire par rapport au premier. La réparation du péché par la restitution à la Majesté divine de l'honneur qui lui a été ravi s'appelle *satisfaction ;* la réparation du péché par la soumission à la peine méritée s'appelle à proprement parler *expiation*. Quand la réparation de l'injure ou l'acquittement de la peine se font par un autre au nom du coupable, la satisfaction ou l'expiation sont dites *substitutives* (vicaria). L'expiation, prise à part, aurait donc moins d'importance que la satisfaction. En réalité cependant ces deux éléments sont étroitement associés dans le salut opéré par le Christ : la Rédemption les embrasse tous deux et les unit indissolublement. Ce fait posé, la satisfaction n'apparaît jamais mieux que lorsqu'elle est poussée jusqu'à l'acceptation de la peine, et l'acceptation du châtiment ne se conçoit pas d'ailleurs sans l'intention de rendre pleinement au Créateur l'honneur que le péché lui avait refusé ". Cf. also Hugon, *Le mystère de la rédemption*[3], p. 14.

A *The Moral Element: Love and Obedience of the Redeemer.*

The redeeming work of Christ is everywhere represented by the Apostle as proceeding from the will of the Father. It is for this reason that the oblation which the Redeemer made of Himself has the value of a meritorious act of obedience, which on the one hand annulled and repaired the disobedience of Adam, and on the other became the cause of His personal exaltation. In fact, Saint Paul tells us that Christ died in our behalf at the will of the Father: " God commendeth his charity towards us, because when as yet we were sinners, Christ died for us " (Rom. v, 8, 9). God gave His Son for all: " He spared not even his own Son, but delivered him up for us all " (Rom. VIII, 32). What the Law could not do God has done by sending His own Son into the world: " For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son ..... hath condemned sin in the flesh " (Rom. VIII, 3). " It hath pleased the Father through him to reconcile all things unto himself " (Col. I, 19, 20), " for God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself " (II Cor. v, 19).

On the other hand the Apostle frequently recalls the love and obedience of the Saviour in His redeeming work. Again and again he tells us that Christ died for us (I Thess. I, 10 ; II Cor. v, 15), and, more precisely, for our sins (Gal. I, 4). Speaking of himself, the Apostle exclaims: " Christ Jesus came into this world to save sinners of whom I am the chief (I Tim. I, 15), and again, " the Son of God loved me and delivered himself for me " (Gal. II, 20). The same thought is beautifully expressed in Rom. v, 6-9: " For why did Christ when as yet we were weak, die for the ungodly ? For scarce for a just man will one die ; yet perhaps for a good man some one would dare to die. But God commendeth his charity towards us, because when as yet we were sinners Christ died for us ". In his epistle to the Ephesians he exhorts all to " walk in love as Christ also hath loved us, and hath delivered himself for us, an oblation and a sacrifice to God for an odour of sweetness " (v, 2); he admonishes husbands to " love their wives, as Christ also loved the Church, and delivered himself up for it " (v, 25). As the " one mediator of God and men, the man Jesus Christ gave himself a redemption for all " (I Tim. II,

5, 6) that " he might redeem us from all iniquity " (Tit. II, 14), for " being rich He became poor for our sakes that through his poverty we might be rich " (II Cor. VIII, 9) [1].

The Redeemer's Death was not only a proof of the greatest and most generous love but also of a magnanimous obedience. This latter consideration is developed especially in Romans c.v, where the Apostle is comparing the work of the first and Second Adam, the two heads of humanity. Against the transgression of the first Adam, who introduced sin and death into this world, the Apostle opposes the act of Christ who brought justification and life; and in v. 19 the Apostle calls this salvific and justifying act of the new Adam an ὑπακοή, an act of obedience; " For as by the disobedience of one man, many were made sinners, so also by the obedience of one, many shall be made just ". So too it was this obedience of the God-Man, of the Saviour, which was the cause of His personal exaltation : " Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus, who being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God, but emptied himself, taking the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of men, and in habit found as a man, he humbled himself, becoming obedient unto death, even to the death of the cross ; for which cause God also hath exalted him, and hath given him a name which is above all names " (Phil. II, 5-9).

A generous love and a perfect obedience culminating in a voluntary sacrifice, — this is what Saint Paul especially considers in the redeeming work. From the bosom of humanity to which He came to render the supernatural life which it had lost, the well-beloved Son, in whom the Father is well pleased,

1. Cf. RICHARD, art. *La rédemption, mystère d'amour*, RechSR, May, 1923, pp. 193-218, RIVIÈRE, *Le dogme de la rédemption*, p. 262 ff., OXENHAM, *Catholic Doctrine of the Atonement*[2], p. 75, ZANECCHIA, *Il sacrificio redentivo a Gerusalemme*, p. 84 ff.

Against the exaggerated penal theories of Lutheran theologians, modern Protestant writers give a more prominent place to the moral element of the Redemption ; cf. ROBERTS, *Salvation through Atonement*, p. 65, JAMES, art. *Cross*, DAC, p. 268, SCOTT, *The Atonement*, pp. 13-14, LIDGETT, *The Spiritual Principle of the Atonement*, pp. 60, 276 ff., BABUT, *Étude biblique sur la rédemption*, pp. 114-117. HOLTZMANN, *Lehrbuch der neutestamentlichen Theologie*[2], vol. II, p. 120, while favoring the thesis that even in Saint Paul saving power attaches to the death only in connexion with, and as a culmination of, the previous life, allows that emphasis falls upon the death as the last, all decisive proof of all the voluntary service upon which the Son of God had entered when He took the form of a servant ; cf. also FEINE, *Theologie des neuen Testaments*[3], p. 311.

causes to rise towards God more love, glory, and honor than that of which original sin and all sins had robbed Him. The perfection of this obedience and love which animated the God-Man from His entrance into the world until His Death on the cross, constitutes an act of immense reparation, which reestablishes the supernatural order broken by the transgression of Adam [1].

For since Christ is the Head of the race, since He is *solidaire* with the humanity which He came to redeem, we are intimately associated with Him in His acts of love, honor, and obedience which He renders to God. Thus mankind, in close union with its Head and Representative, repares its faults and cooperates in the restoration of its supernatural life. Hence this vicarious satisfaction of Christ is a consequence of the solidarity, of that spiritual unity, realized in principle at the Incarnation.

The love and obedience of the Redeemer, however, consisted principally in the acceptance of death, the penalty for sin. Christ freely accepted humiliations, sufferings, and death : *proposito sibi gaudio, sustinuit crucem.* Since the consequence and penalty of Adam's sin, which was a refusal of obedience, was death, one can readily understand how reparation should indeed consist in love and obedience, but in love and obedience taking the form of sufferings and death. Sin which had destined man to eternal death leads the Son of God, whom love had made Son of Man, to death, that we might become adopted sons in eternal life. In the Pauline Epistles the moral and penal elements are both essential and inseparable

---

1. As Hugueny, art. *La rédemption*, RSPhTh, 1911, p. 316, well remarks, we must always keep in mind, when we study this redeeming work of Christ, the divine dignity of His Person : " Cet amour est humain en tant qu'il sort d'un Cœur fait de notre chair et de notre sang ; mais parce que ce Cœur appartient à une personne divine et à raison des grâces incomparables qui divinisent la puissance d'aimer dans l'humaine volonté d'un Dieu-homme, l'acte de charité du Christ est, dès le premier instant, l'incomparable chef-d'œuvre de la création, un hommage et un amour meilleurs que toute la charité ravie au monde par le péché d'Adam, et par conséquent une réparation suffisante de ce péché ".

Cf. also St. Thomas, III^a, q. 48, a. 2 : " Ille proprie satisfacit pro offensa qui exhibet offenso id quod aeque vel magis diligit quam oderit offensam. Christus autem, ex caritate et obedientia patiendo, majus aliquid Deo exhibuit quam exigeret recompensatio totius offensae humani generis : 1° quidem propter magnitudinem caritatis ex qua patiebatur ; 2° propter dignitatem vitae suae, quam pro satisfactione ponebat, quae erat vita Dei et hominis ; 3° propter generalitatem passionis et magnitudinem doloris assumpti ".

in Christ's redeeming work. It is by the two indissolubly united that man was redeemed [1].

B. *The Penal Element: Sufferings and Death of the Redeemer.*

References to the historical sufferings and death of Our Saviour are far more numerous in the Pauline Epistles than is usually supposed. The Apostle tells us that Our Lord took His repast with the disciples " the same night on which he was betrayed " (I Cor. XI, 23), a statement, which contains *in nuce* a large part of the history of the Passion : the reference to the " night " implies a chronological knowledge of the events, and the word " betrayed " points to information concerning the traitor and the arrest. Saint Paul also knows of the outrages and invectives with which Jesus was overwhelmed . " For Christ did not please Himself, but as it is written : ' The reproaches of them that reproached thee fell upon me ' " (Rom. XV, 3). In himself, he says, the sufferings of Christ abound (II Cor. I, 5, IV, 10 ; Col. I, 24), nay, he was mulcted of all things to know the fellowship of His sufferings, being conformed to His death (Phil. III, 10). In fact, is there not an allusion to the sufferings of Christ and to His prayer on the Cross in the description which the Apostle gives of his own abandonment at the moment of death : " at my first answer no man

1. The relation of the penal and moral elements is clearly brought out by PESCH, *Das Sühneleiden unseres göttlichen Erlöser*, p. 143: " Gewisz weisz jeder, dasz Blut, rein stofflich genommen, die Seele nicht reinigt und die Sünde nicht tilgt. Von dem Blut gilt dasselbe was der Heiland von dem Fleische sagt : Das Blut nütz nichts, der Geist ist's, der lebendig macht. Aber erstens ist das Blut des Gottmenschen nicht Blut ohne Geist. Zweitens wird in jenen Aussprüchen das Blut nicht betrachtet als eine blosze Sache, sondern als das vom Heiland für uns aus Liebe und zum Zweck der Erlösung vergossene Blut. Es wird also nicht getrennt von den Akten der Seele Christi. Aber trotzdem bleibt es wahr, dasz wir weder durch die Akte Christi an sich noch durch das Blut Christi an sich, sondern durch beide zugleich erlöst worden sind ". It is true that the Redemption considered from a speculative view-point could have taken place in innumerable different ways. But when we consider it as it took place in the historical order and as it is presented to us in the Pauline Epistles we find that the penal and moral elements are equally constitutive of the redeeming work ; hence any attempt to regard the penal element, from this view-point, as " accidental " or " secondary " is to be rejected. For the question is not to choose between the two elements, but to show how in the Redemption, which in its plan as well as in its execution is a work of love, justice plays an essential role. Cf. MEDEBIELLE, o. c., vol. I, p. 6.

stood with me, but all forsook me ; may it not be laid to their charge ; but the Lord stood by me, and strengthened me, and I was delivered out of the mouth of the lion " (II Tim. IV, 16, 17). The Saviour out of love died voluntarily for us, having been fastened with nails (Col. II, 14) to a wooden (Gal. III, 13 ; Acts V, 30) cross (Rom. VI, 6 ; Gal. II, 20, VI, 14), and afterwards buried (I Cor. XV, 4). The Crucifixion took place at the time of the Passover (I Cor. V, 7), under the procuratorship of Pontius Pilate (I Tim. VI, 13), and the Jews were responsible for the death of the Lord (I Thess. II, 15).

The redeeming Death of Christ is presented by the Apostle under various aspects. At times the instrument of this Death is put by metonymy for the Death itself, and salvation is then said to be by the Cross. The " word of the cross " (I Cor. I, 18), forms accordingly the substance of his message ; he will glory only in the Cross (Gal. VI, 14), and will have but one object of knowledge and interest, — " Jesus Christ and him crucified " (I Cor. II, 2). It is this doctrine concerning " Christ crucified " which is the " power of God ", although unto the Jews it was " a stumbling-block and unto the Gentiles foolishness " (I Cor. I, 23, 18). It was " by the cross " that Christ reconciled both Jews and Gentiles to God " in one body, killing the enmities in himself " (Eph. II, 16), that He " blotted out the hand-writing of the decree that was against us, which was contrary to us, and hath taken the same out of the way, fastening it to the cross " (Col. II, 14). It was this same image of Christ on the cross that the Apostle depicted in vivid colors before the eyes of his Galatian converts (Gal. III, 1).

At other times the Apostle emphasizes the shedding of the Redeemer's Blood : " It hath well pleased the Father through him to reconcile all things unto himself making peace through the blood of his cross " (Col. I, 19, 20). " God hath proposed Christ to be a propitiation through faith in his blood " (Rom. III, 25), and " when as yet we were sinners Christ died for us ; much more therefore, being now justified by his blood, shall we be saved from wrath through him " (Rom. V, 8, 9). In Christ " we have redemption through his blood, the remission of sins, according to the riches of his grace " (Eph. I, 7), in Him those " who some time were afar off, are made nigh by His blood " (Eph. II, 13). From the above texts it is evident that the Apostle constantly attributes to the " Cross " and to the

" Blood of Christ " the abrogation of the Law, reconciliation, peace, and salvation from the wrath to come. If the death of Christ, however, has these effects it is because it is the expiation of the guilt and penalty of sin.

The penalty which God pronounced against sin consists, as we have noted in the first part of our study, in death, a compendious term whereby the Apostle denotes all the evil consequences of sin. To this physical and eternal death all men are subject, and hence the Apostle is careful to present the Death of Christ as an expiation of the guilt and penalty of sin [1]. Thus in Rom. IV, 25 he writes: " He was delivered up for our sins " (παρεδόθη διὰ τὰ παράπτωμα ἡμῶν), — a passage in which sin is directly represented as the cause (διὰ) of Christ's death ; if our sins therefore led Christ to death, it is by dying that He underwent their penalty. Again, if " he that is dead is justified from sin " (Rom. VI, 7), this is, evidently, because he has undergone its penalty. In the flesh of Christ immolated for us all on the Cross, God definitely condemned and cast out sin (Rom. VIII, 3). Similarly in Gal. I, 4 and I Cor. XV, 3 the Apostle says that Christ died περὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν, and ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν. Christ's solidarity with mankind, and, more especially, His being made " sin " (II Cor. V, 21) and a " curse " (Gal. III, 13) in our behalf, point to the Redemption in which Christ would become a victim for our sin and in which He would satisfy divine justice. In thus permitting and inspiring Him to suffer and die for our sins God " spared not even His own Son but delivered him up for us all " (Rom. VIII, 32) [2].

1. Cf. PESCH, *Das Sühneleiden unseres göttlichen Erlösers*, p. 41 ff., LAMINNE, *La rédemption*, p. 51 ff., D'ALÈS, art. *Le sens de la rédemption*, RAp, November, 1921, pp. 163-174, HUGON, *Le mystère de la rédemption*[3], pp. 275-276, where the author says : " Pour que la justice soit parfaite, il convient que la réparation vienne de l'humanité, et, par suite, il ne faudra pas considérer seulement la valeur que la passion tire de la personne divine, mais, faisant, pour ainsi dire, abstraction, un instant, de la divinité, examiner ce qui, selon la nature humaine, peut être regardé comme suffisant pour une telle satisfaction, c'est-à-dire toutes les douleurs qu'il faudrait subir dans l'hypothèse où il n'y aurait que la nature humaine pour expier " ; cf. also PRAT, o. c., vol. II[6], p. 233 ff., TOBAC, *Le problème de la justification dans saint Paul*, p. 139 ff., CORNELY, *Epistola ad Romanos*, p. 196, RIVIÈRE, *Le dogme de la rédemption*, p. 227, RICHARD, art. *La rédemption, mystère d'amour*, RechSR, October, 1923, p. 398 ff., MONSE, *Johannes und Paulus*, NTA, 1915, p. 107 ff.

2. ST. THOMAS, *Sum. Th.*, pars 3[a] qu. 47, a. 3, in answer to the question which he asks with reference to Rom. VIII, 32, " Utrum Deus Pater tradiderit

The Death of Christ was not only an expiation of the sins of mankind but it was also, at the same time, a vindication of divine justice. In Rom. III, 25-26 the Apostle tells us that this manifestation of God's intrinsic justice was occasioned by the fact that God had leniently treated the sins of mankind in pre-Christian times, and had thus exposed His moral government to the charge or suspicion of remissness in the punishment of sin : " God hath proposed (Christ) to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to the showing of his justice, for the remission of former sins through the forbearance of God, for the shewing of his justice in this time, that he himself may be just, and the justifier of him who is of the faith of Jesus Christ " [1]. In the expiatory sufferings and death of Christ God is shown to be essentially hostile to sin and to retain His Holiness inviolate.

From the above we are not to infer however, as did the American school of Calvinistic theologians [2], that there were in God two opposing attributes, those of justice and of mercy, and that they were reconciled only in the Cross. That God loved us even before the death of Christ and that out of love He sent His Son into the world is a doctrine which in no way stands in opposition to the teaching that through the expiatory sufferings and Death of Christ we were reconciled to God. For

---

Christum passioni ", gives the following answer : " Secundum *tria* Deus Pater tradidit Christum passioni : *uno* quidem *modo*, secundum quod sua aeterna voluntate praeordinavit passionem Christi ad humani generis liberationem... *secundo*, inquantum inspiravit ei voluntatem patiendi pro nobis, infundendo ei charitatem..... *tertio*, non protegendo eum a passione sed exponendo persequentibus ". Christ's Passion, furthermore, is a manifestation of God's justice : " in quo ostenditur et Dei severitas, qui peccatum sine poena dimittere noluit " (ibid. ad 1^um^). Cf. also RICHARD, art. *La rédemption, mystère d'amour*, RechSR, October, 1923, pp. 401-402.

1. For a detailed and textual exposition of Rom. III, 21-26, cf. PRAT, o. c., vol. I^9^, pp. 242-247 ; We do not think that the " justice " of which there is question in Rom. III, 25, 26, is a " justice communiquée " as LAGRANGE, *Épître aux Romains*, pp. 77-78, claims but the divine attribute of justice. PRAT, o. c., vol. II^6^, p. 236, well remarks : " Il est incontestable que Dieu, dans le plan actuel du salut, avait en vue de faire éclater sa sagesse et sa justice. On dira qu'il s'agit de la justice justifiante ; mais la justice justifiante n'est qu'un aspect particulier de l'attribut divin de justice ; c'est la justice qui, ayant infligé au péché le traitement qu'il mérite, épargne le pécheur uni à Jésus par la foi ". The view of CORNELY, *Epistola ad Romanos*, p. 193, is fundamentally the same : " Justitiam latiore sensu intelligere malumus, ita ut sanctitas, quae peccatum aversatur, justitia quae condignam peccati vindictam ordinisque laesi reparationem exigit, aliaeque perfectiones morales comprehendantur " ; so too ZORELL, *Novi Testamenti lexicon graecum*, p. 136.

2. Cf. STEVENS, *Christian Doctrine of Salvation*, pp. 174-187, 244-252.

if God out of love could have freely forgiven men's sins, He could likewise, because of the same love, make foregiveness dependent on certain conditions whose fulfilment He made possible to man. God hates the sinner because of his sin, but He loves him because of His will to save, because man is created for His glory and according to His image ; thus the Apostle says : " In times past we were by nature children of wrath even as the rest, but God for his exceeding charity wherewith he loved us even when we were dead in sins hath quickened us together in Christ " (Eph. II, 2-5). Contrary to the assertion of Sabatier [1], no Catholic theologian ever taught that without the intervention of Christ God's attributes would have remained in opposition to each other. They were always convinced that without any prejudice to His justice God could have freely forgiven men's sins. But they also teach that the redeeming work of Christ was a most excellent manifestation of Divine love and power, not because thereby the Divine attributes of justice and mercy were reconciled, but because therein was revealed to man the most perfect harmony of these two attributes. The death of Christ showed at once the love and mercy of God as also the heinousness of sin and its deserving of penalty [2].

By His sufferings and Death which were at the same time informed by a perfect love, obedience, and oblation to God, Christ expiated the guilt and penalty of our sins, vindicated God's intrinsic justice and holiness, and procured for us reconciliation, peace, and salvation. And in this whole redeeming work Christ acts as the Head of mankind, is intimately united to the humanity which He came to save. It is in virtue of this solidarity between the race and Christ, its Chief, that His salvific acts have a value for His whole community : in Him we expiate our sins and satisfy divine justive, in Him we are reconciled to God and God to us.

---

1. *La doctrine de l'expiation et son évolution historique*, pp. 99-100.

2. The idea of a conflict between the divine attributes of justice and mercy, rendered harmonious by the vicarious satisfaction of Christ is no longer held by many modern exponents of the penal theory ; thus DENNEY, *The Christian Doctrine of Reconciliation*, p. 233 says : " Neither does the achievement of reconciliation by Christ imply that there is any schism in the divine nature, as though it would be wrong to forgive freely, or unmerciful to treat sin as what it is. In the divine nature justice and mercy do not need to be composed, they have never fallen out ". Cf. also FORSYTH, *The Cruciality of the Cross*, p. 78-79.

Before proceeding further to determine the precise nature of Christ's sufferings and death, we shall now, in order to avoid needless repetition, state some of the modern theories concerning the Redemption.

(1) *Modern Penal Theories.*

Much time need not be lost here, we think, in considering those theories according to which Christ in His Passion and Death became an object of God's anger, a malediction and anathema in the real sense of the word, an outcast from God, the universal sinner, an object of repulsion to the heavenly court, who suffered the penalties of the damned, who was abandoned and persecuted by the Father, and who did not die until God had discharged against Him all His wrath. Such ideas and expressions, although employed at times even by Catholic preachers in order to produce an oratorical effect, have never formed a part of patristic and traditional Catholic theology [1]. The God which such conceptions suppose, namely, a cruel and sanguinary God, full of wrath, fury, and vengeance, delighting in the blood of its victim, is the God neither of reason nor of the Pauline Epistles [2]. It is to the Lutheran theologians of the Reformation that is due the origin of these outrageous doctrines, and Catholic authors have always been careful to leave to them the monopoly of such notions.

Luther, as is well known, maintained that the state in which man was created was not supernatural. The fault of Adam did not deprive our nature of gratuitous gifts, but perverted and corrupted nature not only by depriving it of the power to do good but by inoculating it with concupiscence. The

1. Cf. Rivière, *Le dogme de la rédemption*, p. 227 ff., 385 ff., Richard, art. *La rédemption, mystère d'amour*, RechSR, October, 1923, pp. 397-418, Oxenham, o. c., p. 71;

2. Protestant theologians have frequently protested against such ideas; thus Roberts, *Salvation through Atonement*, p. 52 says: "The Atonement is the work of all the Three Persons in the Godhead, cooperating in blessed harmony. It is the revelation of the infinite love of the Three Persons in one God. The Father in love gives His only-begotten Son; the Son in love gives Himself; the Holy Spirit in love cooperates at every stage. The Son is the 'beloved' not only at His Baptism and Transfiguration, but also in Gethsamene and on the Cross"; cf. also Lidgett, *The Spiritual Principle of the Atonement*, pp. 380-397.

works of man accomplished under the influence of concupiscence are therefore necessarily and essentially bad. The influence of Christ does not substantially modify this state. After, as before the Redemption, man is radically incapable of doing good, but continues under the domination of concupiscence necessarily to commit sin. There is no internal sanctification, and justification consists in the external imputation of the merits of Christ. Now just as the merits of Christ are attributed to us, so also our sins are attributed to the Lord ; in other words, it is because God had attributed to Christ our sins in such a way that He was cursed and punished in place of the guilty that His expiation is become our own.

Modern penal theories have departed considerably from the older orthodoxy of Lutheranism. In using the ideas of the post-reformation in conjunction with presuppositions drawn from other sources, these theories are typical of much that has been written on conservative Protestant lines on the Atonement. The penal theory is based entirely on the notion of retributive justice, or as many moderns say, on the idea of " law ". God must punish sinners with an eternal penalty, and He cannot pardon until He has realized in Christ an equivalent suffering. Whatever form the theory may take, the idea that satisfaction must be made to the " law " is usually characteristic of the system [1]. Those who do not emphasize the notion of " law ", nevertheless insist that Christ identified Himself with the shame of sin and " experienced " the consequences and divine reaction against sin to such an extent that cessation of communion with God during His Passion necessarily followed.

The first modern exponent of the penal theory who has had a considerable influence on subsequent theology of the Atonement is Dale [2]. According to this author the idea of retribution is essential to all justice and not least to that of God. The punishment inflicted by God is the suffering which has been *deserved* by past sin ; to make it anything else is to destroy its essential character. " But if the punishment of sin ", Dale

1. This idea is especially prominent among American Calvinistic theologians. Thus W. G. SHEDD, *Dogmatic Theology* (Edinburgh, 1889), vol. II, p. 436, says : " Retributive justice is necessary in its operation. The claim of the law upon the transgressor for punishment is absolute and indefeasible. The eternal Judge may or may not exercise mercy, but He must exercise justice ".

2. *The Atonement*[25].

argues [1]," is a Divine act — an act in which the identity between the will of God and the eternal Law of Righteousness is asserted and expressed — it would appear that, if in any case the penalties of sin are remitted, some other divine act of at least equal intensity, and in which the ill-desert of sin is expressed with at least equal energy, must take its place... If God does not assert the principle that sin deserves punishment by punishing it, He must assert that principle in some other way. Some divine act is required which shall have all the moral worth and significance of the act by which the penalties of sin would have been inflicted on the sinner ". It belonged to Him to assert by His own act that suffering is the just result of sin. He asserts it not by inflicting suffering on the sinner but by enduring it Himself. This was not unjust because Christ being Himself very God was not only the Victim but also the Judge and the Moral Ruler of the universe.

Another modern exponent of the penal theory is Forsyth [2]. The author starts out with a psychological theory of the origin of sin, and maintains that an objective real act of God is necessary for the treatment of a world guilty and by its guilt estranged from God. This act of reconciliation will involve " the fundamental, permanent, final changing of the relation between man and God, altering it from a relation of hostility to one of confidence and peace " [3]. The death of Christ is a saving act by virtue of two moral elements which go to make up its total value : the first is expressed by the words " sacrifice " and " obedience ", the second by the words " confession " and " judgment ". Obedience is the truth of sacrifice ; it was so in the Levitical ritual and it is so on the Cross. In the work that God had given Him to do, Christ shed His Blood, i. e. made absolute consecration and sacrifice of His Will. That was the interior side of the giving of His life, for " our will alone is our ownest own, the only dear thing that we can and ought to sacrifice " [4]. However, to gain further insight into the Cross, we must go deeper and pass from the idea of sacrifice to the graver and more ethical side of judgment. For the Cross reveals not only God's love, but His holy love. " Holiness and

1. O. c., p. 450 ff.
2. *The Work of Christ*, and *The Cruciality of the Cross*.
3. *The Work of Christ*, p. 54.
4. *The Cruciality of the Cross*, p. 192.

judgment are forever inseparable " [1], and hence there is also a penal side to the Cross. God must either punish sin or expiate it, for the sake of His holy infrangible nature. " There is a penalty and curse for sin, and Christ consented to enter into that region " [2]. God " judged sin upon Christ's head " and " took Him in the place of sin, rather than of the sinner, and judged the sin upon Him " [3]. The withdrawing of the light of communion with God on the cross was a necessary expresion of that judgment [4]. But Christ's part was not merely a passive one ; it was Christ's active confession of God's holiness from within the sphere of sin's penalty which was the satisfaction to God. " We speak of His confession of God's holiness, His acceptance of God's judgment, being *adequate* in a way that sin forbade any acknowledgement from us to be " [5].

In his Cunningham Lectures for 1917 Denney [6] likewise proposes a penal theory but in an apparently milder form than in his previous books [7]. According to him the agony and Passion were " penal in the sense that in that dark hour He had to realize to the full the divine reaction against sin in the race in which He was incorporated, and that without doing so to the uttermost He would not have been the Redeemer of the race from sin, or the Reconciler of sinful men to God " [8]. His sufferings had to do with sin, and they came on Him " because the world had sinned, and in becoming part of the world He stood committed to experience as its Saviour everything in which the divine reaction against sin is brought home to the soul " [9]. The New Testament utterances, he declares, all assume in the death of Jesus a relation to sin which has no parallel in martyrdom. On the Cross the Sinless Son of God, in love of man and in obedience to the Father, entered submissively into that tragic experience in which sinful men realize all that sin means. He tasted death for every man. The last and deepest thing we can say about His relation to our sins is that He

1. *The Cruciality of the Cross*, p. 205.
2. *The Work of Christ*, p. 147.
3. Ibid., p. 83.
4. Ibid., p. 243.
5. Ibid., p. 126.
6. *The Christian Doctrine of Reconciliation.*
7. Cf. *Studies in Theology*, p. 108, 126.
8. *The Christian Doctrine of Reconciliation*, p. 273.
9. Ibid., p. 273.

died for them, that He bore them in His own Body on the tree ; if we could not say this, it would be impossible to maintain that He knew by experience all that sinful men find to be involved in their sin, nor could we say that He had been made perfect by love.

Garvie [1] proposes the following series of propositions which he considers as essential features of the Pauline doctrine of the Atonement : 1) we must avoid speaking of Christ as punished or as held guilty, or seek any quantitative equivalence between the Passion of Christ and the punishment of sin. 2) We must avoid thinking of a substitution in the external sense of a transfer of penalty, but must conceive it as the self-identification of the Sinless One who took into His own consciousness the suffering and shame of the sinful race. 3) We must avoid representing the satisfaction of Christ's death as offered to an abstract attribute of righteousness and justice, but must recognize that the holy love of God, " as the self-giving of the morally perfect, by necessity of its very nature must include, and also express, hostility to and condemnation of sin in its very purpose of forgiveness ". 4) We must maintain that the moral order conjoins sin and pain, and that Christ being guiltless, suffered vicariously. 5) Christ in enduring the consequences of sin even unto the desolation of death, was conscious of fulfilling His Father's will, and thus His sacrifice becomes an expression of God's judgment and reaction on sin. 6) Just as penitence by moral necessity expresses man's condemnation of his own sin when he seeks God's forgiveness, so it is but the human echo of the necessary divine judgment of the Cross in which forgiveness in offered to mankind. 7) The human conscience can be fully satisfied only by a forgiveness which expresses fully the holy love of God in condemning the sin which is forgiven.

A very recent expression of the penal aspect of Our Lord's Death is the " Experiential Theory " of Snowden proposed in his book written during the world-war, *The Atonement and Ourselves* [2]. The author in his study of the Atonement arrives at the following conclusions :

1) Our Lord did truly suffer the penalty of sin upon the Cross,

1. *Studies of Paul and His Gospel*, pp. 170-172.
2. pp. 17, 146, 179, 186, 188.

and His Death satisfied all the divine requirements, namely, (a) It satisfied Divine Holiness, which requires the separation of the sinner ; on the Cross Our Lord suffered separation from the Father, which is a " cessation of the communion of our spiritual life with God " [1] ; (b) It afforded reparation to outraged justice : the reparation required for the rebellion and self-will of sin is perfect obedience, and this was made by Our Lord in His submission to the fulness of sin's penalty upon the Cross, experiencing both the first and also the second death ; (c) It satisfied the requirements of love : Christ's obedient self-sacrifice was a reparation for man's defiant self-will.

2) Christ suffered the penalty of sin, not as a punishment, but as an experience which would give Him a certain helpful and necessary status for the work of man's salvation. It was only by actually dying Himself and overcoming in the experience of death all those temptations of the soul connected with it, it was only by actual experience of the spiritual weakness and disabilities arising from the alienation of the soul from God, that Christ could communicate to others in and through union with Himself the status of one who had felt the full force of temptation, and could be in them the actual victorious power which man's necessity required. This consideration (" experiential theory ") is the master idea in the author's book.

3) Upon the Cross Christ achieved in His human nature perfect obedience to the will of the Father in conflict with the utmost powers of evil, and under conditions which made it a supreme test and attainment of perfect positive holiness.

4) Man's salvation is brought about by a true identification with Christ which involves him in His sorrow for man's sin, His sin-bearing, and His perfect obedience, so that — (a) In Christ man's imperfect penitence is perfected ; (b) in Christ he suffers the penalty due to his sins ; and (c) in Christ he is able to offer God a perfect obedience as reparation for the disobedience of his sins.

5) This perfect union with Christ amounts to a real identification of personality, so that our imperfect atonement for sin is perfected and made part of Christ's perfect atonement, and is brought about by the power of the Holy Spirit working

1. O. c., p. 180.

through the various means of grace, and especially in the sacraments of the Church.

The penal theories as we have outlined them above contain an element of truth. Penal expiation is indeed an essential part of Christ's redeeming work. But we must remember that the sufferings and death of Christ were not merely a substituted endurance of material pain but also meritorious acts of obedience divine honor, and love. It was by His sufferings and Death which were at the same time informed by a perfect love, obedience, and oblation to God, that Christ expiated the guilt and penalty of our sins, vindicated God's intrinsic justice and holiness, and procured for us reconciliation, peace, and salvation from wrath.

It is only therefore when the penal theory is proposed as the sole explanation of the Redemption that its weak points appear. For what relation is there between the material sufferings on the Cross and the spiritual punishment merited by the sinner, between the sufferings of the Saviour and the eternal damnation of all humanity ? The strongest objection to the theory, however, is that it reduces sin to an external disorder, and considers that mere material suffering is sufficient to repair it. Sin, as we have noted above, consists not merely of a *reatus poenae* but also of a *reatus culpae;* to stop at the former aspect would be to say, in the words of Saint Anselm, *nondum considerasti quanti ponderis sit peccatum;* in such a perspective one would come to the conclusion that God wished and realized the Passion of His Son formally and for itself. Sin is in the first place an injury done to God, it is a free and conscious revolt of the creature against its Creator, and while it is punished it is not repaired by mere pain.

It is consequently only by the introduction of the principle of Christ's love, obedience, and total oblation to God, that the penal element receives its proper meaning and value [1]. This moral element, it seems to us, has not received the proper

---

1. St. Thomas, III[a], q. 48, a. 2, thus summarizes the elements of Christ's redeeming work : " Christus autem ex charitate et obedientia patiendo, magis aliquid Deo exhibuit, quam exigeret recompensatio totius offensae humani generis : primo quidem propter magnitudinem charitatis ex qua patiebatur : secundo propter dignitatem vitae suae, quam pro satisfactione ponebat, quae erat vita Dei et hominis : tertio propter generalitatem passionis, et magnitudinem doloris assumpti ".

emphasis in some of the penal theories mentioned above. An attempt to pass beyond the penal aspect so as to include the spiritual principle of the Atonement has been made by Lidgett[1]. The author retains the view that justice is essentially penal, and follows Dale in his strong expression of the hostility of God towards sin. Yet he is not content with the ordinary view of God's justice as retributive, and considers it as insufficient for the explanation of the Atonement. " Sin must be annulled if the condemnation and the consequences of sin are to be annulled... the surrender of the life under, in, and through penal conditions, its acceptance by God, these are the vital elements in the matter. The perfect union with and surrender to the Father, the fulfilment of all righteousness... all this in, under, and through the penal consequences of sin — it is this positive, active, and spiritual, sacrifice which annuls sin " [2]. The Atonement " must carry us into a region higher than the consequences of sin and wrath, to make satisfaction to that spiritual order of love and righteousness which has been set at naught " [3]. And this satisfaction was rendered by Christ's perfect obedience amid penal suffering: " Death, the witness of wrath against sin, is here doing the worst against Him who stands for guilty men. But His response is the perfect filial response, which makes satisfaction and completes reconciliation " [4].

According to Saint Paul, as we have seen above, both the moral and penal elements enter essentially into the redeeming work of Christ, and neither one must be exaggerated at the expense of the other. As an example of a tendency to suppress completely the penal element in the Redemption we may cite G. C. Workman [5], who popularized in America the system of Ritschl. By considering sin as a simple ignorance which does not provoke the wrath of God, and by reducing all of God's attributes to love [6], this author denies entirely the necessity of a reconciliation of God with the sinner. All that is necessary to save humanity, he maintains, is to change the sentiments

1. *The Spiritual Principle of the Atonement*, pp. 226-282.
2. O. c., p. 272.
3. Ibid., p. 271.
4. Ibid., p. 277.
5. *At Onement or Reconciliation with God, passim.*
6. O. c., pp. 30-54.

of the sinner in regard to God, and hence concludes and unceasingly insists that all expiation is absolutely unnecessary : " His death was nothing in itself, let it be said again, but his life in us is everything " [1]. All such expressions as " propitiation ", " ransom ", " redemption ", and others, which might give a contrary impression are reduced to metaphors. This theory has already been refuted by what we said above : Saint Paul constantly tells us that Christ expiated the guilt and penalty of our sins by His Death (Rom. IV, 25, VI, 7, VIII, 32 ; I Cor. XV,3; Gal. I, 4), that in the " Blood of Christ " we have reconciliation, peace, and salvation (Rom. III, 25 ; V, 8, 9 ; Eph. II, 13, 16 ; Col. II, 14), and that the Cross was the central object of his preaching (I Cor. I, 18, II, 2 ; Gal. III, 1 ; Eph. II, 16 ; Col. II, 14).

Secondly, the above penal theories make the redeeming work of Christ proceed from the retributive justice of God. Saint Paul however, represents the Redemption both in its plan and execution as a manifestation of God's love : " In times past we were by nature children of wrath even as the rest, but God for his exceeding charity wherewith he loved us even when we were dead in sins hath quickened us together in Christ " (Eph. II, 2-5), and again : " God commendeth his charity towards us, because when as yet we were sinners, Christ died for us " (Rom. V, 8, 9). That God loved us even before the death of Christ and that out of love He sent His Son into the world is a doctrine, however, which in no way stands in opposition to the teaching that through the expiatory sufferings and Death of Christ we were reconciled to God and God to us. For if God out of love could have freely forgiven men's sins, He could likewise because of the same love make forgiveness dependent on certain conditions whose fulfilment He made possible to man. Sufferings and death, as we have said above, are in the present order of Providence a punishment of sin. Now the Son of God who was Innocence and Holiness itself, in whom there is no question of personal sins, did not deserve to suffer. But if He did suffer this was by God's will for the penalty of the sins of others. Christ, the Head of the race, freely and voluntarily took upon Himself sufferings which should have come upon the sinner, in order to manifest thereby God's great love and

1. O. c., p. 149.

mercy, and at the same time to satisfy divine justice and show how heinous and how deserving of punishment sin is [1].

Thirdly, while Christ's sufferings were substituted for our punishment, Christ Himself was not punished in the real sense of the word, nor did He become an object of divine wrath. For punishment implies guilt, and guilt attaches to the sin committed and to the person who commits it ; punishment, where there is no guilt, would be an injustice. The New Testament writers and Saint Paul never connect the death of Christ with the divine anger even in passages where the line of argument might have seemed to culminate in such a thought. Such passages as Rom. VIII, 3 ; Gal. III,13 ; and II Cor. V, 21, do not support such a view ; the first passage is to be explained in the sense that God inspired Christ with the will to undergo the Passion for us, while the other two refer to the principle of solidarity. In fact, it seems that the sacred writers deliberately refrained from any language which might suggest that the Son became the subject of the Father's anger or that His Death was due to an ebullition of God's wrath. Even in that cry of infinite pain on the Cross it cannot be said to denote a cessation of communion between the Son and the Father [2]. Descrip-

1. How the individual appropriates the atoning virtue of Christ's redeeming Death will form the object of the third part of our study. The whole question is succinctly and clearly summed up by CORNELY, *Epistola ad Romanos*, p. 196: " Quando Jesum Christum in cruce pro totius mundi peccatis morientem proposuit, una ex parte demonstrare voluit ipsoque facto evidentissime demonstravit, quanta esset sua justitia et sanctitas, quum proprii sui Filii sanguine nostras iniquitates expiandas duceret ; attamen altera ex parte, quum Filium suum morientem vellet esse victimam propitiatoriam. quae virtutem expiantem suam in credentes exsereret cuiusque fructus credentibus gratis applicarentur, simul luculentissime demonstravit, quanta esset benignitas sua ac misericordia. Ex sola quippe illius sacrificii virtute eos, qui in Christum credunt, sine ullis propriis eorum operibus meritisque praeviis justificare decreverat ".

2. LAGRANGE, *L'Évangile selon saint Marc* (Paris, 1920), p. 406, makes the following remark concerning Our Lord's words, " My God, My God, why hast thou forsaken me " (Mk. XV, 34 ; Psalm. XXI, 1) : " On ne peut oublier que ces mots sont empruntés à un psaume. En les prononçant, le Sauveur nous invite à penser que son âme s'entretient dans les sentiments marqués par le psalmiste. Les situations sont les mêmes et cependant, au milieu de ses souffrances, le psalmiste entrevoit la délivrance et le salut ; ne convient-il pas d'attribuer à Jésus les mêmes élévations et encore beaucoup plus parfaites? " It is certain, moreover, that the Fathers never interpreted the above words in the sense of a real abandonment of the Son by the Father, but frequently explained the passage in terms of Christ's solidarity with the race. The application to this text of the idea of solidarity, which plays so important

tions are indeed given implying that Jesus bore sin through a profound realization of what the Divine attitude towards it really is, but in these very descriptions, phrases which might lead to inferences regarding the anger of God being endured by the Son of His love are carefully avoided. Christian faith is always directed to one who was the Son of God, in whom the Father was well pleased, who hung upon the Cross in fulfilment of the mission to which His Father summoned Him, and who must therefore have been in that hour the object of the Father's deep satisfaction and most tender love.

Christ then by a submission to the Will of the Father, which however did not exclude His own initiative, voluntarily accepted and bore in our stead poverty, humiliations, and death, sufferings, which in the present order of Providence are a penalty of sin. But we must not suppose Christ really burdened with the shame or guilt of our faults, nor even can we speak of the penitence, confession, or contrition of Jesus. We must carefully avoid anything which would imply for the Saviour a shade of personal culpability or the least semblance of Divine aversion. Hence the assertions of some of the authors, whose theories we exposed above, that " on the Cross Christ suffered separation from the Father " or that the death of Christ " included many of the characteristics of that of a sin-stained saint (?) cut off by his sin from the realization of God's presence and forgiveness " [1] are untenable. What we may attribute to Christ is the impression produced on a pure conscience by the preception of moral evil, an impression intensified by a lively sentiment of the divine Holiness and by His great love for sinners ; in this sense the " experiential " aspect of our Lord's sufferings, of which we heard so much above, is admissible.

An attempt is sometimes made to assimilate the dereliction of Jesus to the interior states of saints and mystics who at

---

a role in the Pauline Epistles, may be stated in the words of RICHARD, *La rédemption, mystère d'amour*, RechSR, May, 1923, p. 216 : " Il faut dire maintenant que ce mystère a sa réalité morale et psychologique dans l'âme, dans le cœur humain de Jésus, qui se sait, qui se sent lié à tous ses frères, qui dilaté, d'une manière virtuellement infinie, veut nous atteindre tous et chacun dans notre misère et dans notre péché : Il m'a aimé et s'est livré pour moi (Gal. II, 20)..... en vérité, c'est nous, pécheurs, qui le faisons souffrir et non pas son Père ". Cf. also GRIMAL, art. *Une opinion théologique sur la rédemption*, RCF, 1912, t. 71, p. 100 ff.

1. SNOWDEN, *The Atonement and Ourselves*, p. 180.

times feel themselves to be abandoned by God without being so in reality. In the soul of saints elevated to the highest mystical states a sentiment of painful abandonment and of obscurity often succeeds a lively feeling of the presence and union with God ; this succession of light and darkness often contributes in the designs of God to an advancement in a life of faith. But that which is intelligible in saints who ordinarily do not have experimental certitude of God's friendship is not applicable to Jesus Christ who enjoyed the beatific vision. The soul of Jesus can enjoy the intuitive vision of God and at the same time suffer either because of physical pain, or because of the experimental or infused knowledge of the evils which await Him, or because of the sin in humanity ; but He cannot at the same time enjoy the beatific vision and be deprived of it, even momentarily, since this would be a true dereliction.

Others seek an analogy to the sufferings of the Redeemer in those mystical states of the soul in which saints enjoy a great peace and a superior spiritual joy but at the same time suffer intensely because of physical evils, or because of the consciousness of the traces of sin which still remain in them, or because of the sin which dominates mankind. But this analogy is again deficient because, on the one hand, there were no remains of sin in our Lord, and, on the other, His sufferings were more disinterested. If, however, it be said that during the agony and Passion the intuitive vision of Our Lord did not in any way diminish the intensity of His moral and physical sufferings, or impede the spontaneous movements of fear, desire, and sadness, dereliction in this sense may be admitted. For while the intense contemplation of saints, since it is not entirely free from sensible activity, diminishes somewhat their physical and moral sufferings, the intuitive vision of Jesus, being independent of the senses and of the activity of the soul in so far as it informs the body, did not have a moderating influence on His sufferings.

These few suggestions which we have here developed are sufficient to show, we think, in what particulars the modern penal theories, which we have stated above, are untenable or need to be corrected. Before proceeding further to consider the various aspects of the Redemption, the various modes of being of the same Mystery as they are presented to us in all

their richness in the Pauline Epistles, we shall consider another modern theory, which in some respects resembles the former.

(2) *Theory of Vicarious Penitence or Confession.*

The exponents of this theory are bound together by the general idea that Christ as Man made an adequate satisfaction to God, not by the enduring of any penal sufferings, but by revealing, as the Representative of mankind or as the inclusive, universal Man, that spirit of grief for sin and acknowledgment of its guilt, that positive holiness and conquest over sin, which when displayed in its perfection — a perfection possible only to one sinless Himself — was the one perfect atonement for sin.

The first important representative of this theory to be mentioned is McLeod Campbell. In his work, *The Nature of the Atonement* [6], he approaches the problem chiefly from the view-point of the Fatherhood of God. Christ in dealing with God on behalf of men, he tells us, must be conceived of as dealing with the righteous wrath of God against sin and as according to it that which was its due. Christ deals with it by making a perfect confession of men's sins. That perfect confession which was only possible to perfect holiness was offered by Christ to the Father. " That oneness of mind with the Father, which towards man took the form of condemnation of sin, would in the Son's dealing with the Father in relation to our sins take the form of a perfect confession of our sins. This confession, as to its own nature, must have been *a perfect Amen in humanity to the judgment of God on the sin of man* " [1]. This confession the Incarnation rendered not only possible but inevitable. It was the perfect expiation of sin and the earnest of that pardon which men need not simply from their Judge but from their Father. Together with His confession we must also emphasize Christ's intercession ; its power as an element of Atonement is evident if we consider that it is the voice of the divine love coming from humanity, offering for man a pure intercession according to the will of God [2]. Thus Christ makes in humanity the due moral and spiritual

1. O. c., p. 116.
2. Ibid., p. 127.

atonement for sin. He in behalf of man "responds to the divine wrath against sin, saying, ' Thou art righteous, O Lord, who judgest so ' ... and in that perfect response He absorbs it " [1]. Christ's atoning work culminated in His death ; He passed through it in the spirit of sonship and so the Atonement was perfected.

Traces of similar ideas are to be found in Oxenham's [2] and Newman's [3] exposition of the Passion. According to the former Christ in His Passion was offering to the Eternal Father the one perfect act of contrition for the sins of His brethren whose nature He had assumed. He was making a general confession of the iniquities of all mankind, which He had taken upon Himself as though they were indeed His own. Nor is this true only of those incidents of the Passion which are crowded into the last twenty hours of His earthly ministry. Every act of that spotless life had a sacrificial power. It was at once a confession of the sins that had separated man from his Maker, and an intercession for the transgressors. Even those sufferings which might seem at first sight purely natural have their supernatural side also [4].

In more recent times this theory was again proposed by Moberly [5]. In the view of Campbell stated above Moberly finds two fundamental weaknesses : first, though Campbell establishes in a clear manner the relation of Christ to God, the relation of men to Christ remains indefinite ; secondly, Campbell in his book pays no attention to Pentecost, i. e. to the doctrine of the Holy Ghost. It is to a rectification of these two defects that Moberly applies himself. He reaches his own conclusions through two premisses both of which are the result of a critical investigation of the relevant subject matter in either case. The first principle is that since any sort of penitence must imply a degree of reidentification on the part of the

1. O, c., p. 117.
2. *The Catholic Doctrine of Atonement*[2], p. 72.
3. *Discourses to Mixed Congregations*, p. 139 : " His agony takes the form of guilt and compunction. He is doing penance, He is making confession, He is exercising contrition with a reality and a virtue infinitely greater than that of all saints and penitents together, for He is the one Victim for us all, the sole Satisfaction, the real Penitent, all but the real Sinner " (quoted in OXENHAM o. c., p. 72).
4. O. c., pp. 71, 77, 286, 288.
5. *Atonement and Personality*, pp. 42, 86, 117, 404.

penitent with righteousness, perfect penitence must imply a complete reidentification. But such a penitence is impossible for one who has sinned since the power of sin is within him. Are we then in the presence of the paradoxical truth that a true penitence is as much the inherent impossibility as it is the inherent necessity of every man who has sinned ? No, says Moberly, but a second support is needed if any satisfactory conclusion is to be reached. It is found in the Person of Christ and in the character of His Humanity. Christ who is " identically God " is also " inclusively man " [1]. " Christ *was* humanity perfectly penitent, humanity perfectly righteous, humanity therefore in perfect accord with, and response to, the very essential character of Deity " [2]. And this perfect penitence involved death, not in any way as the endurance of punishment but as its own consummation. But this objective atonement, in the order of salvation of persons, must become subjective and so we are necessarily led on to the doctrine of the Holy Spirit; " It is Pentecost, it is the gift progressively transforming, it is the indwelling of the Spirit of Holiness, the Spirit of the Crucified, which is the transforming of human personality " [3].

The last representative of this theory to be considered is Du Bose [4]. His doctrine of the Atonement is controlled by two ideas : the first, as we have already noted above, is that what Christ did He initially did for Himself ; " Jesus Himself in His humanity needed the salvation which all humanity needs. Salvation for Him, as for us, demanded that conflict with sin and conquest of sin which was preeminently His experience and His achievement " [5]. The second controlling idea is the inclusive character of Christ's humanity. In Christ humanity was redeemed and sin conquered by the victory of holiness. And this salvation, Jesus Christ, or humanity in Him, accomplished through a lifelong and death-completed act of perfect repentance and perfect faith [6]. This objective work of the Redemption, however, does not leave individuals with nothing to do. The crucifixion and resurrection of Christ must be

1. O. c., p. 86.
2. Ibid., p. 404.
3. Ibid., p. 153.
4. *The Gospel according to St. Paul.*
5. O. c., p. 127.
6. Ibid., p. 226.

reproduced in the individual's co-crucifixion and co-resurrection with Christ. However the relation which Du Bose establishes between humanity in Christ and what it does, and individuals and what they do, is far from being clear. Against the possible charge that he is reviving a realistic philosophy with humanity as a universal apart from men, Du Bose answers : " The universality of our Lord's humanity is only explicable upon the fact that His personality is a divine one... the concrete universal of humanity which may be found in Jesus Christ belongs to it not as humanity but as God in humanity " [1].

What is to be said of the above theory of vicarious penitence and confession ? In the first place, the essential elements of the Redemption are, as we have seen above, moral reparation and penal expiation. It was by His sufferings and Death, which were at the same time informed by a perfect love, obedience, and oblation to God, that the God-man redeemed us. It was by the same sufferings and Death that Christ expiated the guilt and penalty of our sins and thereby vindicated God's intrinsic justice and holiness ; it is only in this sense that the conception of " confession " is admissable. But any system which would minimize the role of Christ's sufferings and Death in His redeeming work cannot be reconciled with the teaching of Saint Paul.

Again, it is true, as we explained above, that Christ as Second Adam was the Head and Representative of the race, that He was intimately united with the humanity which He came to redeem. But this solidarity does not imply a substitution of persons but a substitution of effects ; the sufferings of the Innocent and Sinless one were substituted for the punishment which we deserved for our sins. And it is in virtue of the principle of solidarity that Christ's Death has a value for His whole community, the latter being considered as dying with its Chief. This solidarity, however, though very real is mystic : the Head alone undergoes physically the penalty of sin while the members undergo it only mystically.

These events, as we also noted above, take place juridically on Calvary and at the sepulchre, effectively by the participation

1. O. c., p. 297.

of Christ's Spirit through baptism. Now baptism, of which faith is a necessary preparation and condition, is not only a symbol and a rite, but also a sacrament operating what it signifies ; it not only represents the assimilation of the Christian to the Death and Resurrection of Christ but also realizes it.

The theory of Christ's " contrition " and " penitence ", if by these terms is meant that Christ became *solidaire* with humanity in such a way as to be burdened with the shame or guilt of its faults, is simply to be rejected ; for we must carefully exclude anything that would imply for the Saviour any shade of personal culpability or the least semblance of divine aversion. Equally inadmissable is the contention that Christ had assumed a sinful human nature like that of other men. " Contrition " and " penitence " might perhaps be attributed to Jesus in the sense of an impression produced on an absolutely pure conscience by the perception of moral evil, an impression intensified by a lively sentiment of the Divine Holiness and by His great love for men. But the terms are misleading and the sooner our theology is rid of them, the better for Christian piety which can always find the mystery of the Redemption sufficiently rich for its meditations, without recurring to such equivocal ideas as the above.

II. DIFFERENT ASPECTS OR MODES OF CHRIST'S REDEEMING DEATH.

The great variety and richness of Saint Paul's teaching concerning the Redemption is evident to anyone who carefully peruses his Epistles. Since Christ, as we have said above, is our Head, the relation of His works to His members is similar to that of the works of a just man to himself ; and thus Christ by His Passion merited salvation for us. Since this merit however has reference to the offense against God and to the remission of sins, it is, more specifically, vicarious satisfaction. Furthermore, since this satisfaction of Our Lord takes place through penal sufferings and an immolation of Himself to God, it is a sacrifice. Finally when this sacrifice had been accomplished, and the guilt and penalty of our sins expiated, man is liberated from the power of sin, of the flesh, of the Law, and of the spirit-powers, and is restored to the supernatural

state. It is these various aspects of Christ's redeeming work that we shall now briefly consider [1]

A. *Vicarious Satisfaction.*

The expressions which Saint Paul employs to designate the work of Jesus Christ such as ransom, redemption, acquisition, indicate rights properly so called. These privileges of Our Lord have their foundation in the unique position which He occupies in humanity. As contrasted with the progenitor of the human race Christ is the " Second Adam " (Rom. v, 12-19 ; I Cor. xv, 22). The first Adam, the head and fountain of human nature, compromised by his transgression the whole human race ; in a similar manner Jesus Christ represented whole mankind when He restored it to justice. Saint Paul's parallel would be meaningless if Our Saviour had not acted as the Head of entire humanity when He died on the Cross [2]. If His role as Redeemer had been confined to preaching and giving good example, as the modern exponents of the " moral-influence " theory maintain, what need was there of His suffering a cruel death ? Christ became our Redeemer and Mediator only by complementing His teaching and example by acts of true merit. His life and Death were worthy of a recompense involving the whole human race of which He was Chief ; this effect was the means of realizing that universal influence which is demanded by His character as God-Man. Because of Christ's merits supernatural blessings were conferred upon us as if we had

1. Cf. Hugon, *Le mystère de la rédemption*[3], p. 261 ff., *De Verbo Incarnato et hominum Redemptore*, p. 386, d'Alès, art. *Le dogme catholique de la rédemption*, Études, 1913, t. 135, pp. 170-197, Rivière, art. *Rédemption*, RCF, 1913, t. 75, pp. 115-120, Richard, art. *La rédemption, mystère d'amour*, RechSR, October, 1923, pp. 397-418, Mathews, art. *The Functional Value of Doctrines of the Atonement*, JR, March, 1921, pp. 148-159.

Saint Thomas, III[a], q. 48, a. 6 ad 3[um], thus summarizes the multiple formalities of Christ's redeeming work : " Passio Christi, secundum quod comparatur ad divinitatem ejus, agit per modum efficientiae ; in quantum vero comparatur ad voluntatem animae Christi, agit per modum meriti ; secundum vero quod consideratur in ipsa carne Christi, agit per modum satisfactionis in quantum per eam liberamur a reatu poenae ; per modum vero redemptionis in quantum per eam liberamur a servitute culpae ; per modum autem sacrificii, in quantum per eam reconciliamur Deo ".

2. St. Thomas, III[a], q. 48, a. 2 ad 1[um] : " Caput et membra sunt quasi una persona mystica ; et ideo satisfactio Christi ad omnes fideles pertinet sicut ad sua membra ".

merited them ourselves. However, that which is communicated to us is not the meritorious actions themselves but the fruit of these actions; hence from the point of view of the effects obtained the merits of Christ, our Head and Representative, have replaced ours.

Since the merit of Christ had relation to the remission of sins it was, more specifically, vicarious satisfaction [1]. This latter aspect of Christ's redeeming Death is taught in all those passages where it is said that Christ was crucified and died *for* us, *for* all men, *for* sinners [2], that He delivered Himself and was delivered up *for* our sins [3], that He became sin [4] and a curse [5] *for* us, that in Him and by Him God reconciled the world to Himself [6], and that Christ is *our* propitiation, justification and reconciliation [7]. The Death of Christ, considered as a work of love either on the part of God or on the part of Christ, took place ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν. However the fact of vicarious satisfaction is proved less by the preposition ὑπὲρ than by the general movement of Saint

1. Cf. SMITH, art. *The Atonement*, Month, April 1919, pp. 241-249, and art. *The Atonement Theologically Explained*, ibid. May 1919, pp. 348-359, POHLE-PREUSS, *Soteriology*[3], p. 35 ff., LAMINNE, *La rédemption*, p. 95 ff., HUGON, *Le mystère de la rédemption*[3], p. 29 ff., *De Verbo Incarnato et hominum Redemptore*, p. 386, PRAT, o. c., vol. II[6], p. 237, STAAB, *Die Lehre von der stellvertretenden Genugtuung Christi*, pp. 109-116.

2. Rom. v, 8: ἁμαρτωλῶν ὄντων ἡμῶν Χριστὸς ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἀπέθανεν.
Rom. xiv, 15: μὴ τῷ βρώματί σου ἐκεῖνον ἀπόλλυε ὑπὲρ οὗ Χ· ἀπέθανεν.
II Cor. v, 14, 15: εἷς ὑπὲρ πάντων ἀπέθανεν... τῷ ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν ἀποθανόντι καὶ ἐγερθέντι.
I Cor. viii, 11: ὁ ἀδελφὸς δι' ὃν Χριστὸς ἀπέθανεν.
I Thess. v, 10: Ἰ. Χ. τοῦ ἀποθανόντος περὶ ἡμῶν.

3. Gal. i, 4: Ἰ. Χ. τοῦ δόντος ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν.
Gal. ii, 20: ἐν πίστει ζῶ τῇ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ... τοῦ παραδόντος ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ.
I Cor. xi, 24: τοῦτό μού ἐστιν τὸ σῶμα τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν.
I Tim. ii, 6: ὁ δοὺς ἑαυτὸν ἀντίλυτρον ὑπὲρ πάντων.
Tit. ii, 14: Ἰ. Χ. ὃς ἔδωκεν ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν.
Rom. iv, 25: ὃς παρεδόθη διὰ τὰ παραπτώματα ἡμῶν.
Rom. viii, 32: ὁ θεὸς γε τοῦ ἰδίου υἱοῦ οὐκ ἐφείσατο, ἀλλὰ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν παρέδωκεν αὐτόν.
I Cor. xv, 3: ὅτι Χριστὸς ἀπέθανεν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν.

4. II Cor. v, 21: τὸν μὴ γνόντα ἁμαρτίαν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἁμαρτίαν ἐποίησεν.

5. Gal. iii, 13: Χριστὸς ἡμᾶς ἐξηγόρασεν ἐκ τῆς κατάρας τοῦ νόμου γενόμενος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν κατάρα.

6. II Cor. v, 18, 19: τὰ δὲ πάντα ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ καταλλάξαντος ἡμᾶς ἑαυτῷ διὰ Χριστοῦ.... θεὸς ἦν ἐν Χριστῷ κόσμον καταλλάσσων ἑαυτῷ.

7. I Cor. i, 30: Ἰ. Χ. ὃς ἐγενήθη σοφία ἡμῖν ἀπὸ θεοῦ, δικαιοσύνη τε καὶ ἁγιασμὸς καὶ ἀπολύτρωσις.

Paul's thought and by the place which he assigns to Christ in humanity [1]. Since the evil which sin has brought upon men is death, Christ's death which was undergone for men's salvation and because of sin, can only have had the design of removing from them the consequences of sin, i. e. the penalty of sin which consists in death. If He Who was Sinless, and Who consequently did not need to undergo death, nevertheless submits to it, His Death is a vicarious one. Hence that which constitutes the salvific value of the Death of Christ is the fact that this death to which He was not subject, Christ endured in our favor and behalf.

While the passages, which we noted above, immediately signify that Christ died for the profit and interests of sinners, understood in their obvious sense they denote that the death of Christ is precisely profitable to sinners because it delivers them from the death to which they were condemned. If in these texts the Apostle uses the preposition ὑπὲρ instead of ἀντὶ, it is because he wishes to express more than a mere material substitution. It is not only under its aspect of penal expiation but also of moral reparation that Christ's death has a vicarious character ; this second aspect of vicarious satisfaction is taught in all those texts where Christ is represented as voluntarily offering Himself " for us as an oblation and as a sacrifice to God for an odour of sweetness " (Eph. v, 2), and especially in Rom. v, 12-19 where the salutary obedience of the Second Adam is described as annuling the deadly disobedience of the first Adam.

The vicarious satisfaction of Christ was not restricted solely to the sins committed previously to His death, as Menegoz [2] claims, but its character is absolute and universal. It is owing to the fact that Christ's death was in itself an expiation of sin that it is for us a satisfaction for sin : we offer to God the death of Christ in compensation for our sins. It is because Christ our Head endured physically the penalty of death that

1. Saint Paul never uses the preposition ἀντὶ (" instead of ") but always ὑπερ (" in behalf of ", " in favor of "). Ἀντὶ is found in I Tim. II, 6 in the term ἀντιλύτρον (cf. Mt. XX, 28 ; Mk. X, 45) but is immediately followed by ὑπὲρ : ἀντιλύτρον ὑπὲρ πάντων. The preposition περὶ, which fundamentally has the same sense as ὑπὲρ, is employed to express the fact that Christ died for us in I Thess. v, 10 (A, D, E, however have ὑπὲρ). In Gal. I, 4, ℵ, A, D, E give περὶ also.

2. *La mort de Jésus et le dogme de l'expiation*, p. 38 ff.

it is sufficient for us to undergo it mystically to be delivered from sin.

The vicarious satisfaction of Christ took the form of dolorous and penal sufferings and of a total oblation of Himself for God's honor, or, in other words, it was a sacrifice.

B. *Sacrifice.*

In regard to the notion of sacrifice we would first of all remark that the correct or incorrect conceptions of sacrifice among the primitive peoples as well as the theological disputations concerning its nature are no sources of proof for our present study [1]. For us revelation alone comes into consideration and that teaches unequivocally that Christ's Death upon the Cross was a sacrifice in the real and true sense of the word. Though theologians may debate about the essential character of sacrifice, none of them will deny that all its strictest demands were fulfilled in the Sacrifice of the Cross.

The Apostle's teaching concerning the sacrificial character of Christ's Death is clearly insinuated in those texts where he attributes the effects of the Redemption to the Blood of Christ : " When as yet we were sinners Christ died for us ; much more, therefore, being now justified by his blood shall we be saved from wrath through him " (Rom. v, 8, 9) ; in Christ " we have redemption through his blood, the remission of sins " (Eph. i, 7); in Him those " who some time were afar off, are made nigh by his blood " (Eph. ii, 13), and through Him " it hath well pleased the Father to reconcile all things unto himself making

1. Cf. RICHARD, art. *La rédemption, mystère d'amour*, RechSR, October, 1923, p. 407 ff., LAMIROY, *De essentia ss. missae sacrificii*, pp. 54-163, LAMINNE, o. c., p. 185 ff. HUGON, *Le mystère de la rédemption*[3], pp. 276-277, tells us that " si les explications des théologiens sur la nature du sacrifice sont divergentes, il reste un fond commun, une réalité essentielle, sur lesquels toutes les écoles tombent d'accord. Tout le monde doit concevoir le sacrifice comme un acte fondamental de la religion, qui a pour objet de reconnaître, par un signe sensible, le souverain domaine du Créateur et la dépendance de la créature, d'offrir à Dieu le culte quadruple d'adoration, d'expiation, ou de propitiation, d'action de grâces, de demande, et, par suite, d'établir une sorte d'alliance entre Dieu et le groupement humain qui vient de sacrifier. Ces diverses conditions se vérifient à merveille dans la passion de Jésus-Christ ". Cf. PRAT, o. c., vol. II[6], p. 214 ff., KNOKE, *Der christliche Glaube nach Paulus*, p. 22 ff., HEADLAM, *St. Paul and Christianity*, p. 77, GROSJEAN, *La rédemption d'après Franz Leenhardt*, p. 149.

peace through the blood of his cross " (Col. I, 19, 20). The same effects are likewise frequently attributed to Christ's Death (cf. I Cor. XV, 3; Rom. V, 6, 8, 10 ; Col. I, 22 ; Gal. II, 21). These different texts when they are considered not separately but in their *ensemble* naturally suggest the idea of a bloody sacrifice. The Death of Christ is clearly characterized as a sacrifice in Eph. V, 2 : " Christ hath loved us, and hath delivered himself for us, an oblation and a sacrifice to God for an odour of sweetness ", παρέδωκεν ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν προσφορὰν καὶ θυσίαν τῷ θεῷ εἰς ὀσμὴν εὐωδίας [1].

More specifically, the immolation of Christ is assimilated to the sacrifice which seals the new alliance : " This chalice is the new testament in my blood ", τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ αἵματι (I Cor. XI, 25). The divine blood has the virtue of sealing the alliance foretold by Jeremias (XXXI, 31), just as the blood of the victims sealed the Sinaitic alliance. At the moment of concluding the alliance Moses offered holocausts and peace-offerings, poured out some of the sacrificial blood at the foot of the altar, and with the rest sprinkled the people saying : " This is the blood of the covenant which the Lord hath made with you ", ἰδοὺ τὸ αἷμα τῆς διαθήκης, ἧς διέθετο ὁ Κύριος πρὸς ὑμᾶς (Exod. XXIV, 8 ; cf. Heb. IX, 24). The words of Our Lord clearly suggest those of Moses, and the witnesses of the Last Supper could hardly mistake their meaning ; the only difference consists in this that the latter spoke of an old, the former of a new διαθήκη. The term διαθήκη (בְּרִית) has the double force of *foedus* and *testamentum*. The relation of God to mankind after Christ's death is a pact in so far as God promulgated through Christ, as He did

1. In this passage there seems to be a clear allusion to Ps. XXXIX (XL), 7 : θυσίαν καὶ προσφορὰν (זֶבַח וּמִנְחָה) οὐκ ἠθέλησας, σωμας δὲ κατηρτίσω μοι. ὁλοκούτωμα καὶ περὶ ἁμαρτίας (עוֹלָה וַחַטָּאָה) οὐκ ᾔτησας (cf. Heb. X, 5-8). Of the four terms which correspond to the four principal kinds of Mosaic sacrifices Saint Paul retains only the first two, which, in reality, embrace the other two. But if the Apostle here undoubtedly speaks of Christ as a sacrifice, he does not indicate the nature of the sacrifice. It is probable that προσφορά as the more general term relates not to the death only but to Our Lord's life of obedeience, to His θυσία ζῶσα ; while θυσία refers more particularly to His atoning death. In the words, εἰς ὀσμὴν εὐωδίας, the Apostle, as St. Thomas, *Commentaria in s. Pauli Apostoli epistolas* (ed. Taur. 1917, vol. II, p. 62) remarks, " alludit autem hic, quod dicitur Lev. III. Sed certe odor non erat tunc Deo acceptus secundum se, sed secundum suam significationem, in quantum significabat oblationem odoriferam corporis Christi filii Dei ",

through Moses of old, certain conditions and attached certain promises to their fulfilment. But Christ, being the God-Man, Himself promised the inheritance in the new dispensation, and wished to confirm this promise by His Death; from this viewpoint His promises are a testament which " is yet of no strength, whilst the testator liveth " (Heb. IX, 17).

Again, admonishing the Corinthians to remove the incestuous fornicator from their midst, the Apostle writes : " Know you not that a little leaven corrupteth the whole lump? Purge out the leaven, that you may be a new paste, as you are unleavened " (I Cor. V, 6, 7). And since the Christians were the celebrating the Paschal season, Saint Paul makes his exhortation still more à propos by adding : " For Christ our pasch is sacrificed ", καὶ γὰρ τὸ πάσχα ἡμῶν ἐτύθη Χριστὸς (I Cor. V, 7 ; cf. Exod. XII, 21, XIII, 6-9). As soon as the paschal lamb was sacrificed, the Israelites, immediately ceased eating leavened bread, the symbol of corruption (cf. Mt. XVI, 6, XIII, 33 ; Lk. XII, 1 ; Gal. V, 9). But now, says the Apostle, Christ Who was prefigured by the paschal lamb of the Jews, is sacrified, and hence we too must put away the old leaven. The Jews, who yearly slew the typical lamb, abstained from leaven and celebrated their paschal feasts for only a week. Christ, however, the antitype,was sacrificed only once, and hence we must always continue to " feast, not with the old leaven, nor with the leaven of malice and wickedness, but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth " (I Cor. V, 8).

Finally, the sacrifice of the Cross is for the Christians what the solemn day of the *Kippourim* was for the Jews, namely, a sacrifice of expiation or propitiation : " God hath proposed Christ Jesus to be a propitiation, through faith in his blood ", ὃν προέθετο ὁ θεὸς ἱλαστήριον διὰ πίστεως ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι (Rom. III, 25). What, it may be asked, is the meaning of ἱλαστήριον [1] in this passage ? Luther translated the word

1. The term ἱλαστήριον occurs under different forms in Heb. II, 17 (ἱλάσκεσθαι) ; I John II, 2, IV, 10 (ἱλασμός) ; Heb. IX, 5 (ἱλαστήριον, in the sense of propitiatory) and Rom. III, 25 (ἱλαστήριον). Cf. also Mt. XVI, 22 ; Lk. XVIII, 13. These passages are all the guidance which the NT affords us for determining the meaning of the term. In the LXX ἱλαστήριον corresponds to *kappōreth* (cf. Exod. XXV, 26) which designated the golden plate of the ark. *Kappōreth* is derived from the verb *kāfar*, which, as is evident also from the Syriac and Arabic, has the fundamental meaning of " to wash ", " to efface ". The form *kippēr* has the same sense, and is usually employed to denote " to

by *Gnadenstuhl;* Ritschl [1], followed by Workman [2], gives it the same interpretation, so that ἱλαστήριον is He whom God had set forth to be a mercy-seat. In proposing this explanation these authors evidently think of the *Kapporeth,* the lid of the ark of the covenant, the central seat of God's saving presence on earth and of His gracious revelations to man. On this golden plate the blood of the bullock and of a goat were sprinkled at the yearly feast of expiation. The blood of the appointed victims became propitiatory only when it was on the *Kapporeth.* In this case the Apostle's meaning would be that God in subjecting Christ to death, has set Him forth before mankind as the antitypical seat of mercy, the One in whom the gracious, saving presence of God is manifested. But this explanation can with difficulty be applied to Rom. III, 25. In the first place as B. Weiss remarks [3]: " the explanation of ἱλαστήριον as referring to the mercy-seat, according to which Christ is regarded as the bearer of God's gracious presence, and the sprinkling of which with His Blood in the manner appointed for the sacrifice of the great day of the atonement becomes efficacious for the forgiveness of the sins of the Church, breaks down upon the circumstance, that, as the name of a concrete

---

expiate " sin ; whence is derived *kōfēr,* λύτρον, *propitiatio,* and *kappōreth,* ἱλαστήριον, *propitiatorium.* Cf. DRIVER, art. *Propitiation,* HDB, vol. IV, pp. 128-132. In profane sources the word occurs six times : 1) *Dio* CHRYSOSTOMUS, Oratio XI, p. 355 of Reiske : καταλέιψεν γὰρ αὐτοὺς ἀνάθημα κάλλιστον καὶ μέγιστον τῇ Ἀθηνᾷ καὶ ἐπιγράφειν: ἱλαστήριον Ἀχαιοὶ τῇ Ἀθηνᾷ τῇ Ἰλιάδι; 2) in PATON and HICKS, *The Inscriptions of Cos,* Oxford, 1891, no. 81 p. 126 : Ὁ δᾶμος ὑπὲρ τᾶς αὐτοκράτορας Καίσαρος θεοῦ υἱοῦ Σεβαστοῦ σωτηρίας θεοῖς ἱλαστήριον, — an inscription which is anterior to Saint Paul's time ; 3) in another inscription of Cos of uncertain date ibid. no. 347, p. 225, ἱλαστήριον designates as above a votive object or a monument erected in honor of Jupiter ; 4) JOSEPHUS, *Ant.* XVI, 7, 1 : narrates how Herod penetrated into the grave of David to steal, and how thereupon struck with fear he erected an ἱλαστήριον μνῆμα λευκῆς πέτρας at the entrance of the tomb ; 5) IV Macch. XVII, 22 : διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τῶν εὐσεβῶν ἐκείνων καὶ τοῦ ἱλαστήριου θανάτου αὐτῶν, ἡ θεία πρόνοια τὸν Ἰσραὴλ προκακωθέντα διέσωσεν; 6) GRENFELL and HUNT, *Fayum Towns and Their Papyri,* London, 1900, no. 337 (2nd century A. D.) p. 313 : τοῖς θεοῖς εἱλαστηρίους θυσίας ἀξιωθέντες ἐπιτελεῖσθαι. In the above examples ἱλαστήριον denotes " a means of expiation or propitiation ", or " that which brings about expiation or propitiation ". The idea of sacrifice is not excluded (cf. no. 6). Cf. DEISSMANN, art. ἱλαστήριος *und* ἱλαστήριον, ZNTW, 1903, pp. 193-212, LIETZMANN, *An die Römer,* p. 47 ff., ZORELL, o. c., p. 262, KNOCKE, o. c., p. 22.

1. *Rechtfertigung und Versöhnung,* vol. II, p. 170 ff.
2. O. c., p. 65 ff.
3. *Biblical Theology of the New Testament,* (E. T.), vol. I, pp. 425-426.

instrument and without the article, ἱλαστήριον cannot have ' the value of a special idea ', and that in this sense it could not be made operative through faith ". Secondly, besides being inherently inappropriate, the use of such symbolism is foreign to the Epistle.

The full meaning of ἱλαστήριον becomes evident only when the term is studied in its context and in relation to the general doctrine of Saint Paul. In Rom. III, 25 the Apostle connects the ἱλαστήριον with a justice expressed in a " wrath revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and injustice of men that detain the truth of God in injustice " (Rom. I, 18). Its purpose is to show that God's justice is consistent with the fact of His forbearance in the passing over of sins done afortime. There has never been a time when God has not dealt graciously with men. But lest the persistent exercise of divine grace in the forgiveness of sins be considered a challenge of God's righteous opposition to sin, He set forth Christ as an ἱλαστήριον in His Blood that He might Himself be just and the justifier of him that hath faith in Jesus Christ. The term is more probably a substantive than an adjective. It denotes a " means of expiation or of propitiation, " or probably of both, for God is not rendered propitious except in so far as sin is expiated, and the same redeeming act produces at once this double result [1]. The idea of sacrifice is not directly contained in the term but is contained in the phrase, ἐν τῷ αἵματι [2]. In Christ as ἱλαστήριον justice is done not only to the grace of God but also to His wrath, to that solemn reaction of God against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men (Rom. I, 18). Finally,

---

1. DEISSMANN, art. ἱλαστήριος *und* ἱλαστήριον, ZNTW, 1903, p. 211, thus concluded his study of the term ἱλαστήριον and its application to Rom. III, 25 : " Weniger gut paszt dazu Gott als Subjekt des προέθετο wenn Geschenk zu ἱλαστήριον ergänzt wird ; ergänzt man jedoch *Denkmal*, so ist die Sache klar : öffentlich aufgestellt hat Gott den Herrn Jesus Christus in seinem Blut, den Juden ein Ärgernis, den Heiden eine Torheit, uns durch den Glauben ein ἱλαστήριον, ein von Gott gestiftetes Versöhnungs- oder Sühnungsdenkmal ". We think it sufficient however to retain the general meaning of ἱλαστήριον, namely, " ein versöhnendes oder Sühnendes, Versöhnungs- oder Sühnungsmittel ", while its particular determinations are to be derived from the context and the general doctrine of the Apostle.

2. Says SANDAY, *Epistle to the Romans*[5], p. 91 : " It is impossible to get rid from this passage of the double idea (1) of a sacrifice ; (2) of a sacrifice which is propitiatory. In any case the phrase εν τοῦ αὐτοῦ αιματι carries with it the idea of sacrificial bloodshedding ". Cf. also DENNEY, art. *The Gospel a Divine Righteousness*, Exp., 1901, p. 444.

we must always remember that it is God who requires, provides, and receives the expiation offered by Christ, Who Himself was God-Man, acting not as God but as the Head of the race.

Furthermore, unlike the sacrifices of the Old Law, Jesus Christ on Calvary is not only victim, but also the offerer, i. e., His sacrifice is voluntary : " Christ loved us and delivered himself for us, an oblation and a sacrifice to God for an odour of sweetness " (Eph. v, 2) ; " Christ loved the church and delivered himself up for it " (Eph. v, 25) ; " the Son of God loved me and delivered himself for me " (Gal. II, 20) ; " he gave himself a redemption for all " (I Tim. II, 6 ; Tit. II, 14). Hence we see how admirably the notion of sacrifice, of an expiatory and voluntary immolation, where Christ appears at once as victim and as offerer, reunites in itself the double notion of penal expiation and moral reparation. As victim Christ undergoes the penalty of sin and suffers the immolation required by God for the expiation of sin, while, considered as the act of the very one who is offered, this sacrifice is an oblation agreeable to God, an obedience, a complete submission of the entire being, which repairs the disobedience of sin. The voluntary character of Christ's expiation for sin is clearly brought out in Gal. I, 4, II, 20, Eph. v, 2, 25, while in Rom. III, 25, I Cor. v, 7, XI, 25, it is rather the role of Christ as victim that is emphasized.

Sabatier [1] and Workman [2] consider Scriptural sacrifice as belonging essentially to the moral order and as denoting pre-eminently acts of consecration and devotion. Christ, they say, left us an example that we should follow in His steps, He served others self-denyingly that His disciples might do the same ; He suffered patiently for well-doing that we might be ready to suffer in a similar way for doing well ; and He offered Himself on behalf of all that all might possess and exhibit His spirit of self-sacrifice. We do not deny that the above qualities were indeed preeminently exemplified in the life and sacrificial death of Christ but we deny that they offer an adequate explanation of the latter ; such a restricted interpretation deprives the redeeming death of Christ of all its objective value and coincides with what is known as the " moral influence " theory of the Redemption. Of course, Workman throughout his book is

1. *La doctrine de l'expiation et son évolution historique*, p. 97. Cf. also GROSJEAN, o. c., p. 149.

2. O. c., p. 60, 135.

tormented with horror at the idea that Christ could do anything which would render God propitious or bring about a change in Him. And, in fact, the picture of a cruel and sanguinary God, taking delight in the blood of His victim is truly pagan. Views like these made their appearance at the Reformation and are to be found especially among Lutheran theologians. Monopoly of these ideas has never excited the jealousy of Catholic theologians, and, with the exception of a few impassioned orators, were always repudiated by patristic and traditional Catholic thought.

An attack on the commonly accepted theories of Scriptural sacrifice has recently been made by M. Scott [1]. According to him the presupposition on which all particular theories agree, namely, the essentially penal view of sacrifice with its concomitant doctrine of substitution is erroneous. But once the idea of punishment and of quantitatively equivalent suffering is abstracted from sacrifice, the idea of substitution departs from it, and a new relation between offerer and offering arises : the identification of one with the other. To this very idea the Jewish ritual, Scott tells us, gave significant expression : whatever the gift placed upon the altar, its meaning was always the same, namely, the willingly submitted will and an entrance into sonship. Of this meaning some gifts were more representative than others, but most appropriate were the offerings which symbolised life. But if, as was intended by the ritual, the submission of the offerer must always accompany its outward expression and embodiment in sacrifice, Christ's submission must in the end carry with it that of those in whose behalf it was made. In regard to this theory we would remark that while Catholic theology regards penal expiation as one of the constitutive elements of Christ's sacrificial Death, it never speaks of the former in categories of mathematical or quantitative equivalence; besides, in His sufferings and Death, which He underwent in our behalf, humanity was intimately united to and *solidaire* with its Head and Chief. Secondly, if it can be proved that the essence of Scriptural sacrifice is indeed " a freely submitted will " this would be an additional proof for our manner of regarding the sacrificial Death of Christ ; the sacrificial principle of which the Old Testament sacrifices were imperfect

1. *The Atonement*, p. 6 ff.

expressions reached its most sublime manifestation in the Sacrifice of the Cross.

We have seen above that the Apostle constantly associates with the Death of Christ considered as sacrifice the ideas of expiation and propitiation, of peace and reconciliation. Before proceeding to study the next phase of the Redemption we shall briefly consider this immediate effect of Christs' sacrificial Death, namely, reconciliation and salvation from wrath to come.

(1) *Reconciliation.*

The first effect of Christ's sacrificial Death is the appeasing of God's wrath against the sinner, or the reconciliation of God with humanity. " Reconciliation " (καταλλαγή) is considered by modern Protestant theologians as the historical equivalent of the present popular term, " Atonement " [1]. As in the Old Testament so also in the New the usage of the word presupposes an estrangement between God and man. On man's side this estrangement is the direct consequence of sin ; on God's side it is the direct result of His Holiness, for His wrath must rest upon the disobedient (Rom. 1, 18). In the Pauline Epistles the term is used to denote the changed relations between God and man brought about by the Person and sacrificial Death of Jesus Christ. This *rapprochement* between God and humanity is especially a consequence of that absolute obedience rendered to God by Christ, the Head and Representative of the race ; this obedience implied the conversion of all humanity to God, and repaired not only the disobedience of Adam but of all his posterity. As a redemptive term " reconciliation "

1. The term " atonement " was introduced into English theology by the AV's translation of Rom. v, 11 where it rendered καταλλαγήν by " atonement ". The RV however, translated the same term by " reconciliation ". Modern authors consider " atonement " and " reconciliation " as synonymous. Thus Scott, o. c., p. 21, says, " ' Reconciliation ' is in fact the grammatical and historical equivalent of ' atonement ' " ; so too Johnson, *Suffering, Punishment, and Atonement*, p. 87 : " Reconciliation is the near equivalent of Atonement " ; cf. also Workman, o. c., p. 9 ff., Roberts, *Salvation through Atonement*, p. 60, Knox, *The Glad Tidings of Reconciliation*, p. 75, Hitchcock, F. R., *The Atonement and Modern Thought*, p. 255 ff. As noted above, the theory of those authors who by " reconciliation " understand man's change from a state of ignorance to a recognition of Christ's teaching and example, is wholly inadequate. This view which resolves itself into the " moral influence " theory of the Redemption will be considered later.

is peculiar to Pauline usage, and is found in Rom. v, 10, xi, 15 ; II Cor. v, 18 ff. ; Eph. ii, 16 ; Col. i, 20.

Many modern theologians as Lightfoot [1], Ritschl [2], and in fact all the exponents of the " moral influence " theory of the Redemption, maintain that καταλλαγή denotes a change in the attitude not of God towards man but solely of man towards God. This theory is based on the assumption that sin is ignorance and that consequently all that is necessary for reconciliation is to change our relations to God. Hence in this opinion the meaning of " reconciliation " and of its equivalent, " atonement ", is singularly reduced. This view, however, is inadmissible. No doubt there are passages where ἐχθρός denotes the hostility and καταλλαγή the reconciliation of man to God. But if we consider the language of Scripture as a whole, it does not seem that it can be explained in that way. Thus in the immediate context of Rom. v, 10 ff., we find the words τὴν καταλλαγήν ἐλαβόμεν, which imply that the reconciliation comes to man from the side of God, and is not due directly to any act of his own. We may note here also the familiar χάρις καὶ εἰρήνη, to which is usually added ἀπὸ θεοῦ, in the greetings of the Pauline Epistles. Again in Rom. ii, 28, ἐχθροί is opposed to ἀγαπητοί, a term, which is certainly passive ; hence ἐχθροί cannot be entirely active. Furthermore, it is difficult to separate the ideas of propitiating a person from such terms as ἱλαστήριον (Rom. iii, 25). Finally, there is frequent mention of the wrath of God as directed against sinners not merely at the end of time but also presently (Rom. i, 18). When that anger ceases there is surely a change on the part of God as well as of man. Hence we naturally infer that the explanation of the passages

1. *St. Paul's Epistle to the Colossians and Philemon*[5], p. 159 ff.

2. O. c., vol. II[4], p. 230 ff. ; This view, however, is rejected by many Protestant authors ; thus GARVIE, o. c., p. 169, writes : " It is only a very superficial interpretation of Paul's teaching which can assume that the reconciliation is only of man to God. The reconciliation takes place first as an objective fact through Christ ; Christ's propitiatory declares God reconciled to man... Men are entreated to accept this objective fact so as to be changed in their subjective feelings to God " ; So too MACKINTOSH, o. c., pp. 73-74 : " There is little doubt that for St. Paul reconciliation is two-sided — not only of man to God, but of God to man. ..... To say that God has no need to be reconciled seems to imply that right and wrong are equivalents in God's sight, a conclusion much worse than an absurdity. The God who is all gentleness and grief, imploring sin-stained men to be at peace with Him is not the God of the Bible, or of nature, or of fact ; nor is He the God and Father of Jesus Christ ".

which speak of enmity and reconciliation between God and man is that these latter are not on one side only but are mutual.

What reasons, it might be asked, can he assigned for this reluctance to accept the Pauline view that reconciliation must deal with hostility on God's side as well as on man's ? First of all, there is an exaggerated anthropomorphic interpretation of God's wrath against sin; it is set in opposition to His love, as if the two were mutually exclusive, or it is made the expression of a purely juridical demand for punishment. But this, as we have seen above, is not the Apostle's view ; according to him, wrath and love are not in conflict in the Divine Being, but are the expressions of one, perfect, holy, Personality. Secondly there is an unethical conception of the Divine immutability ; God, it is said, is immutably and eternally Love, and hence He does not need to be and cannot be reconciled. But this is to impute an immutably to God which practically denies that He is a living God. However, to arrive at a clearer notion of the Pauline doctrine, let us now examine in detail some of the Apostle's characteristic statements concerning reconciliation.

In Rom.v, 10, 11, the context clearly shows that the reconciliation spoken of is that of God to men: " For if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of His Son, much more, being reconciled shall we be saved by his life. And not only so, but also we glory in God, through our Lord Jesus Christ by whom we have now received reconciliation ". The Apostle speaks here of reconciliation as something received by man in the form of an accomplished fact. Although the act of man, in receiving the reconciliation by obedient faith, is implicitly recognized as completing the divine purpose, the Pauline contention is that there is a reconciliation on the part of God antecedent to any reception of it on the part of man. God is regarded as having established anew a relation of peace by putting away His hostility towards sinners. Men then are primarily the objects of reconciliation. Otherwise the force of the Apostle's argument in v. 8, " God commendeth his charity towards us, because when as yet we were sinners Christ died for us, " would be of little value. In Eph. 11, 16 and Col. 1, 20 this same Pauline sense prevails : the reconciliation is a work wrought by God in Christ, and men are besought to receive it that it might become effective in them individually

The classical passage for the Apostle's doctrine on reconciliation is II Cor. v, 18-20 : " All things are of God, who hath reconciled us to himself by Christ and hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation. For God indeed was in Christ, reconciling the world to himself, not imputing to them their sins. And he hath placed in us the word of reconciliation. For Christ therefore we are ambassadors, God as it were exhorting by us. For Christ, we beseech you, be reconciled to God ". A careful examination of this passage leaves the conviction that the Apostle held the view that reconciliation was a change from mutual hostility resulting from the sinfulness of mankind to mutual friendship between God and man, that this change was God's own work accomplished in Christ, and that it requires for its completion the receiving of it as a gift by union with Christ [1].

To the reconciliation of humanity with God in Christ there corresponds, therefore, on the part of God the remission of men's sins : God, says Saint Paul, was in Christ, reconciling the world to himself, not imputing to them their sins, μὴ λογιζόμενος αὐτοῖς τὰ παραπτώματα αὐτῶν (II Cor. v,19) ; in Him we have redemption, through His Blood the remission of sins, τὴν ἄφεσιν τῶν παραπτώματων (Eph. i, 7). This divine pardon extends not only to personal acts of sin, to the παραπτώματα, but also to the Sin dwelling in the flesh of every man and drawing down upon humanity the divine judgment of condemnation, κατάκριμα. For according to the Apostle, " There is now no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus, οὐδὲν ἄρα νῦν κατάκριμα τοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ (Rom. viii, 1).

" Reconciliation ", καταλλαγή, is used by Saint Paul to denote especially our deliverance from the present wrath of God. But, according to the Apostle, through Christ's redeeming work

1. Cf. Cornely, *Epistolae ad Corinthios altera et ad Galatas*, p. 172 : " Apostoli juxta Patris ordinationem Christi rem gerentes eiusque locum tenentes munus Christi continuant, et quod Pater per Christum hominem antea fecit, id nunc per Apostolos, Christi vicarios, facere pergit. Pro Christo igitur cunctos obsecrant, ut in gratiam amicitiamque Dei redire studeant ea praestantes, quae ad hunc finem sunt necessaria, fide nimirum ac poenitentia reconciliationem a Christo nobis meritam apprehendentes. Qui enim ex fide viva sunt justificati, ii pacem habent ad Deum per Jesum Christum (Rom. v, 1) ". Cf. ibid. the beautiful quotation from St. John Chrysostom. So too Prat, o. c., vol. II[6], pp. 265-266, writes : " Ici comme toujours, l'initiative vient du Père. Ce n'est donc pas l'homme qui se réconcilie avec Dieu ; c'est le Père qui nous réconcilie *à* lui-même par le Christ ou dans le Christ.

we shall also be delivered from eschatalogical wrath ; this final deliverance is expressed in the Pauline Epistles by the term " salvation ", σωτηρία.

Saint Paul frequently tells us that salvation was procured for us by the Death of Christ : " For God hath not appointed us unto wrath, but unto the purchasing of salvation by our Lord Jesus Christ who died for us " (I Thess. v, 9, 10 ; cf. I Cor. i, 18; Eph. v, 23). Hence Christ is our σωτήρ : " But our conversation is in heaven, from whence also we look for the Saviour, our Lord Jesus Christ " (Phil. iii, 20 ; cf. Eph. v, 23). Salvation is often brought in relation to the final judgment : " If any man's work burn, he shall suffer loss, but he shall be saved, yet as by fire " (I Cor. iii, 15 ; v, 5) ; " Christ died for us, much more therefore being now justified by his blood, shall we be saved from wrath through him " (Rom. v, 9) ; " For if thou confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus and believe in thy heart that God raised him up from the dead, thou shalt be saved " (Rom. x, 9). The Gospel is a Gospel of salvation (Eph. i, 13 ; I Thess. ii, 16 ; II Thess. ii, 2 ; I Cor. xv, 2 ; Rom. i, 16). Sometimes the Apostle presents salvation as something already actual (II Cor. vi, 2 ; I Cor. i, 21, ix, 22 ; xv, 2 ; Rom. viii, 24). Faith is the means whereby salvation is appropriated by the individual (II Thess. ii, 12 ; I Cor. i, 21, xv, 2 ; Rom. i, 16, x, 19). Hence, just as in the case of reconciliation, God is the author of salvation, Christ its meritorious cause, and man its subject and recipient. Though " salvation " is primarily a liberation from final wrath, Saint Paul at times considers it as already accomplished and consequently projects it into the present ; the Apostle is not accustomed to trace between initial election and final salvation, between justice and glory, the rigid line of demarcation to which we are accustomed.

La réconciliation est à plusieurs degrés. D'abord Dieu, ayant constitué son Fils victime d'expiation, oublie les crimes des hommes par égard pour ce Fils. Ce n'est encore qu'une réconciliation en puissance ; pour qu'elle devienne actuelle, il faut dans l'homme un mouvement de retour, mouvement qui s'opère, avec le concours de l'homme, sur l'appel et sous l'impulsion de Dieu. Les apôtres sont les premiers invités à la réconciliation, dont ils sont constitués les hérauts et les agents, parce qu'ils reçoivent la charge officielle de la promulguer et de la transmettre.... Enfin, pour que la réconciliation soit effective, les hommes doivent préparer, par leur libre assentiment à la foi, un terrain propice à l'action divine. Initiative du Père céleste, message apostolique, réponse de l'homme à ce message, telles sont les trois phases ou les trois étapes de la réconciliation ".

We have seen above that the Apostle considers the redeeming work of Christ mainly in its Godward aspect, i. e. as having on objective value before God. By His Death which was at the same time a perfect act of love, obedience, and oblation to God, Christ expiated our sins, and procured for us reconciliation and salvation. The characteristic of the most prevalent modern view on the Redemption, the " moral influence " theory, is its interest in man, and its desire to express the doctrine of the Atonement wholly in terms of man. Because of the popularity of this theory in contemporary Protestant theology it is fitting that we examine it more at length.

(2) *The " Moral-Influence " Theory.*

The tendency to give at least some place to the Godward view of the Redemption was definitely rejected by Ritschl in his *Rechtfertigung und Versöhnung* (vol. III) [1]. His theory of the Atonement is entirely manward, and, in fact, the " reduced " Christology which he adopts renders any other theory impossible. According to Ritschl, justification, or the remission of sins, is the acceptance of sinners into that fellowship with God in which their salvation is to be realized and carried out into eternal life. As we have said above, he rejects the penal wrath of God, because God already loves the sinner who is to be saved. For if we assume that God forsees the final inclusion of sinners in His kingdom, we have no alternative but to trace their redemption back to His love in an unbroken line. In fact, God's righteousness is His self-consistent and undeviating action

---

1. In the theology of Ritschl the break with the fundamental facts of Christianity is complete. It is a Christianity without Christ, a redemption without a Redeemer, a salvation without a Saviour. All that remains of the great soteriological acts is the mission of the son of Joseph to announce to the world that God is Father. And in thus setting aside the dogma of the Redemption the Ritschlians claim that they are merely carrying to its ultimate conclusions the teaching of Luther. The principle of subjectivism, then, proclaimed by Luther, has led in Protestantism to the destruction of the fundamental dogma of Christianity. But let us hear the views of some the Ritschlians themselves (quoted by STAAB, *Die Lehre von der stellvertretenden Genugtuung Christi*, p. 256) :

HARNACK, D. G., III³, 812 : " Ritschl, der geschmähteste Theologe des Zeitalters, hat in seiner Beschreibung des Evangeliums in kräftiger Weise... den Ertrag der zweihundertjährigen Arbeit der evangelischen Theologie an dem Verständnis der Reformation und die Ergebnisse der Kritik am doktrinären Luthertum zum Ausdruck gebracht " ; and in his *Reden und Aufsätz*,

in behalf of the salvation of members of His community ; in essence it is identical with grace. Hence a penal satisfaction to God is wholly unnecessary, nor can it be possible that One who knew no guilt should regard His sufferings as in any way penal. In fact, Ritschl does not regard guilt as necessarily involving penal evils of any external kind. The guilt is itself the punishment, or at least constitutes the penal character of such evils as the forfeiture of divine sonship.

Sin and guilt are, therefore, according to Ritschl, indentical with the interruption of fellowship with God, and it is to a restoration of that fellowship that the Redemption is directed. Christ brought about the Atonement in a twofold manner : in the first place, He Himself preserved unbroken the experience of God's fellowship, and, secondly, the whole object of His life was to bring men into this same fellowship with God ; this latter effect, however, was not brought about by an expiation or satisfaction offered to God, but by introducing men into the membership of the Church, the Kingdom of God, which is a community of those who share Christ's own consciousness of sonship. The death of Christ is regarded as having exactly the same purpose as His life : it was encountered as a consequence of faithfulness to His vocation ; it was one great manifestation of perfect holiness, obedience, and fellowship with God, and by this manifestation sin was condemned.

A very similar point of view is defended by Stevens [1]. According to him, the moral view of the work of Christ is the truest and most satisfactory conception which we are able to form of His mission, lifework, and passion. He explains the

---

II, 153, the same author again says : " Ritschl hat den Grundgedanken des Evangeliums und der Reformation kräftig und klar erfaszt und aus den romantisch-kirchenpolitisch-philosophischen und mystischen Verklitterungen und Banden herausgeführt ".

KATTENBUSCH, *Von Schleiermacher zu Ritschl*, p. 80 : " Im Ritschlianismus gelangte man wieder zu den Ausgangspunkten der Reformation, zu den historischen Grundgedanken Luthers zurück ".

LOOFS, D. G., III[3], 463 : " Aufgabe der Gegenwart ist es die reformatorischen Grundgedanken konsequenter und allseitiger durchzuführen, als es im 16. Jahrhundert geschehen ist und geschehen konnte. Die Gegenwart hat an das 16. Jahrh. so anzuknüpfen,dasz die Epigonenzeit (welche den " Dogmatismus " wieder einführte) ausgeschlossen ist ".

How the principles, laid down by Luther and carried to their logical conclusions by the Ritschlians, have been taken up in turn by the English exponents of the " moral-influence " theory, will be shown in the following pages.

1. *Christian Doctrine of Salvation*, pp. 532-536.

term " justice " as covering both God's mercy and His Holiness ; it is God's justice to Himself, His benevolence to man. And of this Divine love the Passion of Christ is the consummate revelation. As to the question how man is redeemed Stevens gives substantially the same answer as Ritschl : Christ saves men by bringing them into fellowship with God, by enabling them to realize the life of sonship to God, which is their true design and destiny, and by founding and fostering by the Spirit of His life among and in men the Kingdom of the Godlike. The death of Christ is not the ground of forgiveness, but rather its outcome and expression ; it is the method of God's love whereby His eternal willingness to save is revealed. In fact it is God's nature to seek and to save ; for Him to do so is not to be doing something extraordinary, peculiar, and special. Hence when men thus see Christ in love bearing the burdens of their sins in His profound sympathy and suffering, how can they avoid hating their sin. They must see that God will save at whatever cost of suffering.

According to Tymms [1] God must do all He rightly can to exterminate sin and to save sinners. But the author finds that forcible suppression of sin would involve the suppression of human personality, and that penal satisfaction is opposed to the testimony of Scripture as well as to the nature of God. Hence the remedy of sin and a satisfaction to God is to be sought in the reconciliation of man to a state of voluntary obedience to the Divine Will, and this can be secured only through a revelation of God's love. This revelation reaches its climax in Christ's death, which reveals at once God's hatred of sin, since He gave His Son that it might be destroyed, and God's power to forgive, since, even to those guilty of the sin of crucifying Christ, pardon was extended. Christ's death then proves " the love of God to all who appreciate its meaning ", and " in this proof lies the redemptive power of the Cross ".

In America a similar view has been popularized by Workman [2]. The author presents his book to the public feeling " assured that people of all classes will be relieved to know that the work of Christ was necessary, not to appease the divine anger, nor to vindicate the divine honour, nor to satisfy the divine justice,

1. *Christian Idea of Atonement*, pp. 81, 167, 450.
2. *At Onement or Reconciliation with God.*

but to bring men through union with him, into a right relation with their maker " [1]. According to the Scriptures, Workman tells us, nothing is needed to enable God to pardon sin and make Him propitious, i. e. nothing external or objective is required to enable Him to forgive. In fact, God is not only willing to be reconciled, but desirous of reconciliation, and doing all He can by every possible means to reconcile men to Himself. During His ministry Christ was practically engaged in reconciling men to God by His life and teaching. But His mission was not absolutely necessary: thus His immediate followers, the Jews, already had a knowledge of God and consequently were already reconciled to Him [2]. Christ redeemed us in that He communicated to us His spirit and inspired us with His life. The Redemption is a purely subjective experience. Being a personal matter, there is no more mystery about at-one-ment between man and God than there is between man and man. The death of Christ possessed no particular significance nor saving efficacy but it was the culminating expression of the spirit of His life. All such ideas as " sacrifice ", " propitiation", " ransom " and " redemption " are to be regarded as highly figurative and metaphorical [3].

One of the most recent representatives of the " moral-influence " theory is Rashdall [4]. This author seeks an interpretation of the Atonement which would commend itself to the modern spirit and satisfy all the demands of progressive Christian thought. The Pauline doctrine, he says, is not acceptable because it is based on a mistaken and untenable rabbinic exegesis of the Old Testament. So too the " juridical forensic view of the Atonement has become impossible to modern thought, not merely because of the immoral or childish ideas of justice upon which it is based, but also because it treats the relation between the Father and the pre-existent Son as the relation between distinct juridical persons, one of whom could offer and the other receive a sacrifice, one of whom could impose and the other endure a punishment " [5]. Hence the author finds that an explanation which involves little that would

1. O. c., preface, p. 6.
2. Ibid., p. 55.
3. Ibid., pp. 17, 37, 55, 63, 101, 134 ff., 159.
4. *The Idea of Atonement*, pp. 435-464.
5. O. c., pp. 445-446.

not commend itself to the modern mind is that which makes the atoning efficacy of Christ's death depend upon subjective and ethical effects produced by the contemplation of that work upon the mind of the believer [1]. If we can say that God is to some extent revealed in all men, then it becomes possible to think of Him as making a supreme, culminating, unique, revelation of Himself in one human character and life, i. e. in the historical Jesus of Nazareth. The death of Christ may then be looked upon as completing that revelation of the nature and character of God which it was the object of Christ's whole mission to seth forth. If the heart of that revelation is to be found preeminently in the self-sacrificing death of Christ, it is because the character of God as revealed by Christ may be summed up in the statement that God is love. And the love which is awakened on our part towards Christ and towards the Father will express itself in repentance and in regeneration of life [2].

In France this theory is represented by Sabatier [3] and Menegoz [4]. According to the former the death of Christ is the most powerful appeal to repentance which humanity has ever heard, and also the most efficacious and most fruitful in marvellous results. The cross is the expiation of sins only because it is the cause of the repentance to which remission is promised. There is in the world, he says, no other expiation but repentance i. e., that inner drama of the conscience in which man dies to sin and rises again to the life of righteousness. There is nothing greater nor better for the destruction of sin and the salvation of the sinner ; it is the accomplishment in us of the work of God.

The position of Menegoz is somewhat similar to the above. However, according to him, salvation is based not on the Death of Christ but on His living teaching which revealed to us the conditions on which God is willing to accord us mercy. These conditions are repentance and faith, the former being a withdrawal from sin, the latter a movement of the individual

---

1. ibid., p. 437.
2. Cf. Rivière, art. *Où en est le problème de la rédemption*, RSR, April, 1923, pp. 211-232.
3. *La doctrine de l'expiation et son évolution historique*, p. 105 ff. Cf. Grosjean, *La rédemption d'après Franz Leenhardt*, p. 140 ff.
4. *La mort de Jésus et le dogme de l'expiation*, p. 42.

towards God ; fundamentally it is the one and same internal movement considered under two aspects. This and only this, the author insists, is all that God required and requires from sinners. The lesson taught by the Cross is indeed a consolation to us in our earthly sufferings but it has no relation to the forgiveness of sins.

The theory of Redemption proposed by Christian evolutionist theologians, though often couched in strange and misleading terms, likewise resolves itself ultimately to the category described above. On the Cross, W. L. Walker[1] tells us, we see man still standing in the flesh but possessing the full power of the life of the Spirit ; it is really a case of the " survival of the fittest ". To raise man out of the life of the flesh into that of the Spirit was the aim of all the Divine working in the world, and in Jesus Christ this was manifested as perfectly accomplished. In Him humanity had reached its destined fitness for eternal life. Though it is only too true that egoism, self-love, and self-interest still reign, and that mere earthly considerations still too greatly limit man's horizon, there is nothing which so softens men's hearts, mitigates their selfishness, and expands their outlook, as the Cross of Christ with the Holy Spirit of love that proceeds therefrom. Through the Cross of Christ the Divine Spirit entered the world in a new redemptive fulness and in a higher form than it did at the first creation, and has become the power of a new spiritual and eternal evolution of man. This " Spirit " however does not refer to a supernatural Personality but simply denotes Christ's example of self-sacrifice, or the principle of altruism.

Christ, according to Scott[2], came not to reverse the fall of man, still less to bear the punishment consequent upon that fall, but to complete that process of which the fall was a symptom — man's evolution from the natural to the spiritual, from the animal into a being capable of the fullest consciousness of God. Christ came in the fulness of time to point out the way along which mankind must henceforth pass to perfection. He came to inaugurate yet another departure in the evolution of mankind. In Christ man can see all that was meant for him to attain and how that attainment may be secured. Christ

1. *The Cross and the Kingdom*, p. 311 ff.
2. *The Atonement*, p. 371 ff.

came to call men to intelligent and conscious sonship and He exemplified in His own Person the sonship to which He summoned them. Furthermore, Scott informs us, we must not isolate Christ's Atonement from Creation, nor indeed from all the subsequent history of mankind. There has been only one process at work in the world: science calls that process evolution, Christianity calls it Atonement.

We have dwelt at length on the above theories in order to show how their authors, though proceeding from different premises and following different methods of treatment, arrive invariably at the same conclusion. Some as we have seen are dominated by mystic tendencies and place in relief the revelation of God the Father or the generous love of the Saviour, and see in these latter a moral condemnation of sin. Others more realistic regard the Redeemer as a model of abnegation and sacrifice, as the providential type of our destiny, and consider His death as a lesson of moral heroism. But they all agree in that they consider the redeeming work of Christ not in its Godward but solely in its manward aspect, and reduce its value to its moral significance, i. e. to the effective repercussions which may be realized by it either in the individual or in history. And, in fact, can one expect a different theory in a theological system where the authority of Sacred Scripture is denied and where all supernatural elements are carefully set aside, where God's intrinsic justice and Holiness are reduced to love and where it is uncertain at times if His personality is maintained, and where the doctrines of original sin and Christ's divinity are suppressed ? The theology of the Redemption becomes accordingly a branch of Christian psychology and sociology, and on this shifting ground of religious experience there is room for an indefinite variety of personal constructions[1].

1. This great confusion in Protestant theology in regard to the doctrine of the Atonement became evident more than half a century ago. Thus in 1883, F. Hastings, the editor of the *Homiletic Magazine* decided to offer his readers what he called, after the well-known dialogue of Plato, a " clerical banquet ". To this " banquet " fourteen theologians responded, among whom was one Catholic. These essays were later published in one volume under the title, *The Atonement: a Clerical Symposium.* In 1899-1900 the *Christian World* again summoned its readers, but this time to a " theological banquet ". Seventeen theologians responded, and their essays were later published under the title, *The Atonement in Modern Religious Thought: a Theological Symposium*[3] (London, 1907). Both of these *Symposiums* were examined in detail by Rivière, in two articles, *La rédemption devant la pensée moderne; deux*

Although the theologians mentioned above frequently claim a sort of monopoly on the moral considerations flowing from the Redemption, we would remark that this aspect of Christ's redeeming work was far from being unemphasized in traditional Catholic theology. Saint Paul, the greatest of preachers, would he not be familiar with the power of the Gospel as an ethical appeal ? In fact, he frequently tells us that the mystery of the Cross was the greatest proof of divine love : " God commendeth his charity towards us, because when as yet we were sinners Christ died for us " (Rom.v, 8, 9 ; cf. Eph. v, 2, 25); " He spared not even his own Son, but delivered him up for us all " (Rom. VIII, 32). He often exhorts his converts to imitate the self-sacrifice of Christ : " Christ died for all, that they also who live may not now live to themselves but unto him who died and rose for them " (II Cor. v, 15). Of this mysticism the Apostle himself is a living example : " And I live, now not I, but Christ liveth in me. And that I live in the flesh, I live in the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and delivered himself for me " (Gal. II, 20). Even as Christ died and rose again, so also the Christian who died with Christ in baptism ought henceforth live with Him a new life exempt from all sin (Rom. VI, 1, 11). To defile the flesh by sin is unbecoming to those who were redeemed and bought at so great a price (I Cor. VI, 20). The Christian must always bear about in himself the " mortification of Jesus " (II Cor. IV, 10) so as to present his body " a living sacrifice, holy, and pleasing to God " (Rom. XII, 1).

Again, the same love of Jesus, the Redeemer and Head of humanity, ought to move us to love our brethren : " Destroy not him with thy meat for whom Jesus died " (Rom. XIV, 15).

---

enquêtes dans l'église d'Angleterre, RCF, 1912, t. 70, pp. 161-180, 278-305. Abbé Rivière after recalling that the divine truth must finally prevail,concludes pp. 304-305 : " De nos deux *Banquets* on emporterait plutôt l'impression contraire, à voir comment dans l'Église d'Angleterre voisinent ou s'entre-choquent, non seulement les conceptions théologiques, mais les croyances dogmatiques les plus opposées. L'agnosticisme et le libéralisme y apparaissent comme des puissances "; and again, p. 161 : " dans le protestantisme la division atteint la doctrine jusqu'en ses œuvres vives et nul principe n'apparaît qui puisse arrêter l'envahissement du mal, de telle facon que, sous les coups répétés de cette double critique historique et philosophique qui sévit dans la pensée moderne, il semble que chez eux le concept même de foi doive sombrer à bref délai. Nulle part on ne voit mieux s'affirmer tous les excès de l'individualisme ".

Those that are stronger ought to bear the infirmities of the weak and not please themselves because Christ likewise " did not please himself, but as it is written : the reproaches of them that reproached thee fell upon me " (Rom. XV, 1-3) From these passages it is clear that the ethical appeal of Our Saviour's love for us in His sufferings and Death, was by no means unknown to the Apostle.

The psychological analyses in which the Liberal theologians take so much pleasure can therefore be accepted as belonging to the fruits of the Redemption. But when it is maintained that the essence of the Redemption consists solely in its ethical appeal, we reject such a theory as absolutely inadequate [1]. Such a view moreover, besides suppressing the objective character of sin and of the Atonement, minimizes the unique role which in the supernatural economy belongs to the life and death of the God-Man. For in this doctrine the redeeming influence of Christ's death is merely accidental, since the primary effect of the Saviour's death is to manifest His love for us and thereby, only indirectly, lead us to penance ; secondly, according to the above opinion, the mediation of Christ is not even potentially universal [2], since it exists neither for those who lived before Him, nor for those who die before the age of reason, nor finally for those to whom the Redemption is not preached. Now, as we have so often said above, it is by His sufferings and Death, which were at the same time the expression of the greatest love,

1. Cf. LAMINNE, *La rédemption*, p. 9 ff. ; many modern authors realize the insufficiency of the " moral influence theory : thus DENNEY, *The Death of Christ*, pp. 126-127, uses the following illustration to refute this theory : " If I were sitting on the end of the pier, on a summer day, enjoying the sunshine and the air, and someone came along and jumped into the water and got drowned ' to prove his love for me ', I should find it quite unintelligible. I might be much in need of love, but an act in no rational relation to any of my necessities could not prove it. But if I had fallen and were drowning, and someone sprang into the water, and, at the cost of making my peril, or what but for him would be my fate, his own, saved me from death, then I should say ' Greater love hath no man than this ' ..... Is it making any rash assumption to say that there must be such an intelligible relation between the death of Christ — the great act in which His love for sinners is demonstrated — and the sin of the world for which in His Blood He is the propitiation ? " Cf. also MORGAN, o. c., p. 98, DALE, o. c., pp. 329, 361.

2. HUGON, *Le mystère de la rédemption*[3], p. 205 : " La Passion a mérité le salut à tous les hommes, elle fait parvenir jusqu'aux païens les plus dégradés des grâces actuelles, des illuminations et des inspirations : s'ils veulent les accepter et les utiliser, ils seront conduits par Dieu jusqu'à la foi et à la justification, qui les feront sortir de l'esclavage satanique ".

of a perfect obedience, and of a total oblation to God, that Christ the Head of humanity, expiated the guilt and penalty of our sins, and merited for us reconciliation and salvation.

Again, as Denney [1] remarks, this view removes God from the center of religion and puts man in His place. Instead of God being man's chief end, man is God's chief end. The work of Christ was not intended to impress men *simpliciter* as an exhibition of unconditioned love but as the demonstration of a love which itself is ethical and looks to ethical issues. What pursues a man in his sin and appeals to him is not a love whic is thinking of nothing but man and is ready to ignore everythi for his sake, but it is a love which in Christ before everyth does homage to that in God which sin has defied. No love can reconcile the sinner to a God Whose inex repulsion of sin is witnessed to in conscience and in the of the world's order against evil. And above all, if said that independently of any value which Christ Death have before the divine majesty, God would stil what He is, such a procedure, we insist, is to put Chr Christianity altogether [2].

1. *The Christian Doctrine of Reconciliation*, pp. 235-23

2. According to the above view all the prophets were so and mediators, and Christ merely the last, and, if you influential of the redeemers. " Si le Christ ", says RIVIÈRE *devant la pensée moderne*, RCF, 1912, p. 287, " n'a pour rôl l'exemple d'une vie parfaite ou, tout au plus, de nous rév qui est aux cieux, ... ne peut-on en dire autant de tou Il n'y a plus de raison de l'appeler notre Sauveur si l'o le fut avec et après bien d'autres ". So too GRANDM DApFC, fasc. XI, col. 1370 : " Il est impossible l'inconsistance de la solution présentée par les th blème du Christ ". Ou bien ils rétrogradent " prophète ", plus grand, meilleur que les aut différant pas essentiellement de ses prédéces ce que Mahomet prétendit être : " le scea et si l'on admet comme vraie sur le terrain r de quel droit donne-t-on l'exemple, les le de Jésus comme normatives, essentielles Jésus peut, disons qu'il *doit*, selon toute v que l'anneau, jusqu'ici le plus brillant, et s'affine continuellement, nécessai si l'on garde au Maître Nazaréen cet survivance chrétienne, au nom d'u que la raison, si elle est convaincue de la fo contredit ".

Secondly, as ORR, art. *The Resurrection of Jesus*, Exp. 1908, p. 4 " such a view has no means of incorporating the Resurrection in

The " moral-influence " theory therefore, in so far as it denies that the redeeming work of Christ is the effective cause of our salvation, and that it has an objective value before God in view of the remission of our sins independently of its psychological influence on our lives, is essentially erroneous. Some of its exponents wish indeed to speak of an " objective " Atonement, but this in an altogether illusory sense. Thus Workman [1] says that we may speak of the Atonement as objective in the sense that it was an " objective provision in the divine mind ; what Jesus did, too, in the days of his flesh by his life and teaching to reconcile men to God, may be described as an objective performance by him for us ". So too Stevens [2] says that Christ's work was objective in the sense that it is a real moral recovery of man from sin to goodness. But who was ever disposed to question or dispute this ?

it might be interesting to ask, are the causes of the of so insufficient a theory and so denatured a view of emption ? The first reason is no doubt to be found n rationalism which instinctively, as it were, pushes in mind to reject the mystery ; the exaggerated of positive methods, aided by the dissolving action hilosophy give additional impetus to this tendency. theory is no doubt a reaction against the revolting Reformation theologians who under the pretext uppressed the moral collaboration of man, and e imposed in the name of the mystery a notion as as repulsive as it was absurd.

summarized above the modern theories on hile many of them contain some element of at they are far removed from the doctrine great trouble has been ", says Work- eking to ascertain what the Scriptures explain the doctrine by constructing indeed is true. Nevertheless, if we ain preconceived ideas and notions

The Resurrection remains at most tion to salvation. It is apt to be felt, ge ".

p. 15.
pp. 532-536.
., p. 25.

and try to read these into the Scriptures the result will ultimately be the same. In fact it is one of the strange anomalies of the Protestant Church to-day that while, in opposition to the Catholics, it started out with the principle that the Bible is the sole rule of faith it has come practically to reject the Scriptures entirely. Under the dissolving influence of Biblical criticism the text is being emendated, its inspiration rejected and whatever remains, after these destructive processes have been applied, is sought to be explained by what is called the Jewish and Gentile background of the Gospel. No originality is allowed to the sacred authors. Protestantism, the religion of spirituale experience, will have no dogmas, and in the measure that the Evangelists and Saint Paul are dogmatic to that extentthey are said to be " Jewish " or " Pharisaic " or " pagan ". The Catholic Church, though it does not hold that the Bible alone is the sole rule of faith, has always maintained its traditional respect for Holy Writ. And it accepts the Pauline doctrine of the Redemption without any question as to its acceptability to the modern " spirit " and " mind ". Hence, to apply in a general way the words of the Oxford Professor, Shears [1], " we have the edifying spectacle of the Church of Rome jealously guarding the Scriptures which Protestants have corrupted ".

Time was when deeds were adapted to creeds, but the inexorable modern mind has changed all that, and to-day creeds are adapted to deeds. In fact, it is in the domain of religion that the modern anthropometric spirit is especially manifest. To-day it is not God but man who is the starting point of religion, it is man and not God around whom religion revolves. According to the American philosopher, James [2], religion is " the feelings, acts and experiences of individual men in their solitude, so ar as they apprehend themselves to stand in relation to whatever they may consider the " divine ". But what is this " divine " ? James tells us that " we must interpret the term " divine " very broadly as denoting the object which is god-like whether it be a concrete deity or not " [3]. Thus man himself creates God and worships at the shrine which his own hands have built.

Again, the anthropocentrism of religion is further evident

1. *The Gospel according to St. Paul*, p. 115.
2. *Varieties of Religious Experience*, p. 31.
3. O. c., p. 34.

in the general attitude of the historical and psychological sciences. Contemporary history of religions seeks to show that our idea of God as the starting point of religion has no historical foundation, and that a study of prehistorical and savage man will reveal that man himself is the source and centre of religion. So too the presupposition of the psychological sciences as they are treated to-day is that the origin of religion can be found either in historical man or in the mind of man. The psychology of the subconscious, religious psychology, Freudian psychology, all have sought to prove that religion arises primarily within man.

These considerations give us an idea of the modern mind and spirit which in turn account for the present-day attitude towards the doctrine of the Redemption. The most popular theory of the Atonement in our times is that which we designated above as the " moral influence " theory. This view places the essence of the Redemption in its ethical appeal. This theory likewise tends to remove God from the centre of religion and put man in His place ; instead of God being man's chief end man is made God's chief end ; God has no *raison d'être,* so to speak, but to look after us ; He must be a God, as the modern philosophers say, who " counts it more to serve than to rule ". Influenced by the principles of pragmatism, these modern exponents of the Redemption retain and insist on the manward aspect of the Atonement simply because they find this doctrine " serviceable " and useful. Apart from its practical utility it is questionable whether the whole doctrine would not have been overthrown long ago.

But if the distinction between the supernatural and natural is denied and the authority of Scripture rejected, on what basis then are we to found a doctrine of the Redemption ? Modern theologians tells us that those who would make the Atonement a luminous reality for themselves must above all do justice to the meaning of " religious experience ". We have already noted above in treating of original sin how modern theologians seek in the conscience of each individual a sufficient basis for the Redemption. Thus Rashdall [1] tells us that the " recent tendency to rest the truth of Christianity upon " Christian experience " is to be welcomed in so far as it implies that the primary appeal is no longer to the external authority of Church

1. *Idea of Atonement,* p. 467.

or Bible or to historical evidence, but to something in the consciousness of mankind ".

The question then naturally arises : what is this " religious experience ", this " moral consciousness " ? Although all schools of philosophy make their appeal to it and all philosophical systems bow to it in unquestioned recognition of its validity, there still remains a deplorable vagueness as to its nature. There is no doubt as to its universality but there is much indefiniteness as to its precise character. Rashdall himself admits that it frequently means at bottom the substitution of subjective emotion for an honest effort to think, or that it involves a refusal to think at all [1]. In fact, in these days when definition and distinction and even logic have passed out of modern philosophy a really precise answer is difficult to find. Its general and widespread acceptance as a method renders its definition unnecessary in the minds of those who use it. James [2] defines religious experience as " any moment of life that brings the reality of spiritual things more home to me ".

In studying its manifestations, it is evident that the starting point of religious experience is self ; and here again we see the influence of the anthropometric spirit of modern philosophy. Self is the starting point, not the higher self of intellectual concepts, but the self of action, the self of experience, the self of moral-values, or the self with the ideal of the infinite in the finite. In both its objective and subjective aspect " religious experience " is something of the self ; through it we come into relation with some power greater than ourselves. God has no meaning for us outside of His relation to our lives, and we have no ground for positing His existence outside of that reference. The search for God is nothing else than a search within the field of our experience ; the Kingdom of God is within us.

Secondly, " religious experience " is an affective state. It has been variously described as a " sensation ", " feeling ",

1. O. c., p. 467.

2. *Letters*, vol. II, p. 215. For a more detailed consideration of " religious experience ", cf. JAMES, *Pragmatism*, London, 1907, and *Varieties of Religious Experience*, London, 1902, LEUBA, *The Contents of Religious Consciousness*, Monist, 1901, HODGE, *Christian Experience and Dogmatic Theology*, Princeton Theological Review, 1910, SCHILLER, *Humanism*, London, 1903, BOSANQUET, *What Religion Really Is*, London, 1920, REEMAN, *Do We Need a New Idea of God*, London, 1918.

" emotion ", " instinct ", " perception " and " sense " ; — all of the psychological or biological order ; or again as a " faith-state ", a " sthenic " affection, " a sense of reality, a feeling of objective presence, a perception of what we might call ' something there ', more deep and more general than any of the special and particular senses " [1] by which the current psychology supposes existent realities to be originally revealed. This " religious experience " is, according to some, a special way of knowing, a special emotion for a particular object; according to others it is not distinct from psychological experiences.

Finally, we might ask, is " religious consciousness " as a way of knowing, variable or constant ? Is it fundamentally the same in all individuals or does it differ ? From what has been said above, it is evident that " religious experience " is not something fixed and stable but something variable [2]. It is primarily an affective state, a " feeling ", a " sthenic affection ", or a sentiment. It is something non-rational, and something which precedes all work of reflection. It pertains to the psychological order, and according to some, even to the biological order as such. And being something affective and psychological it possesses the quality which is common to all psychological states, namely, variability. Perceptions, sensations, feelings, vary from individual to individual. Again, modern theories maintain that consciousness constitutes personality. For a modern then to say that religious

1. James, *Varieties of Religious Experience*, p. 58.

2. Religious experience cannot be a stable way of knowing because first of all it is based on individual needs. Thus the Idealist, for example, has experience, not as an Idealist in common with his other Idealist friends, but rather as an individual. The same is true of the Empiricist. The God and the Christ whom the moderns want is a God and a Christ whom they *feel they can use:* " the gods we stand by ", says James, o. c., p. 331, " are the gods we need and can use " ; and again, " the voice of human experience within us, judging and condemning all gods that stand athwart the pathway along which it feels to be advancing " (ibid., pp. 329-330) is the measure by which certain individuals prefer certain gods at one time and certain gods at another.

Again, religious experience changes not only with the needs of the individual but also with those of the time. Times change, the moderns tell us, and God and Christ should change with them. Not only the expression of our belief in the Deity but also the very nature of the Deity must change. Just as we have discarded the old phaeton of our grandfathers, why should we not also discard the grandfather notions of God and Christ. We must keep up to the minute with our God and Christ, the moderns again tell us, just as we do with our scientific and philosophical theories. Furthermore, recent political

consciousness is fundamentally the same in all persons would be to maintain that we are all one person. Hence of necessity there must be a variety of religious experiences.

But it is especially in its application to the Redemption that the inconstant and unstable character of " religious experience " becomes evident. Thus Rashdall who is himself one of its defenders, says, " the most that anyone can claim on the basis of religious experience is that he knows *his* sins have been forgiven in this way : he cannot say that this is the only way in which the sins of others have been forgiven, or the only way in which such an experience of forgiveness can be attained " [1]. And the author continues : " Christianity does give an experience of relief from sin and a power of resisting sin greater than seems to result from any other religion. But it is quite contrary to experience to say that such a sense of relief is *never* experienced in some degree by good Jews, or Buddhists..... or by Unitarians..... " [2]. Hence Christ, strictly speaking, was not necessary for our Redemption. Finally the author concludes that the experience of Christians does not confirm the theory that salvation is due to the death of Christ but to the sum total of influence that flow from His life and death, His teaching and example, His revelation of God [3].

On the contrary, Mozley [4], starting out with the same premises, tells us that the primary verdict of religious consciousness is that sin deserves punishment, a verdict endorsed by the sinner himself when penitence however fragmentary touches

---

and social developments, which make men increasingly impatient of masters, oblige us to reject a God who rules simply by Divine Right. The oligarchic and monarchical elements which predominate in our common ideas of God cannot be reconciled with the modern democratic urge and impulse. The " higher man " of to-day will not tolerate the old fashioned theism with its exalted monarch. Cf. JAMES, *Pragmatism*, p. 70.

Finally, religious experience must change because it is based on the hypothesis of evolution. There is hardly a single philosophy of religion in existence to-day which does not interpret God and the nature and work of Christ in accordance with evolution. Cf. HOLMES, *The Idea of Evolution and the Idea of God*, HJ, 1923, p. 227.

It is not within the purpose of this study to refute these and similar notions. Moreover, it is not necessary, for to state them is to refute them.

1. O. c., pp. 470-471.
2. Ibid., 471.
3. Ibid., 477.
4. *The Doctrine of the Atonement*, pp. 206-210.

the soul. And he concludes : " We need not shrink from saying that Christ bore penal suffering for us and in our stead " [1]. Here then we are in the presence of two theories on the nature of the Atonement, which, though based on the same principles, are in themselves not only inadequate but essentially opposed to one another. Do we need to insist any longer that in the future there will be as many different theories on the Atonement as there will be different individual " religious experiences " ? Will not this principle, which is the logical outcome of the Protestants' rejection of the authority of the Church, of the Bible, and of the intellect, ultimately lead to a disintegration of all religion, — a result to which Protestantism is slowly but inevitably tending since the Reformation ?

In the presence of so many conflicting opinions it is not surprising that many Protestant theologians, dismayed by this great variety of views and conscious of the defects of each, no longer venture to propose a new theory but merely propose certain suggestions for a possible interpretation of the Atonement. In fact, the effect produced upon the public by so many different views has not been the best. Contemporary writers on the Atonement bitterly complain that the subject is no longer expounded in the pulpit or that it is preached without the assumption of any particular theory. Hence to propose a new theory would be as hazardous as it would be useless.

In view of the comparative failure of what he calls the " more ambitious historic theories ", Mackintosh [2] proposes to study the Atonement " as the presupposition of the redemption of human character " [3]. The author regards the sufferings of Christ as morally necessary. Christ's suffering righteousness, in the first place, delivers those who trust Him from the bondage of sin and ensures their conformity to the will of God. In the nature of moral things it is only by fellowship with the suffering Christ that man can be redeemed from the power of evil. And Christ Himself becomes able to rescue to the very uttermost because He has done and suffered to the uttermost. Christ has reached the utmost point in the way of fidelity to God and of self-sacrificing love for man ; His death expresses in brief intensity what all his life exhibits. There is, if we may say it,

1. Ibid., p. 216.
2. *Historic Theories of the Atonement*, pp. 297-312.
3. O. c., pp. 299.

the supreme development of goodness in Him when He suffers even unto death. A second line of explanation for the necessity of the work and sufferings of Christ is to be found in the fact that they were required for and secured the glory of God. God is supremely glorified because man is redeemed. But why is God glorified in a suffering Christ ? Because " there is found in Him under His sufferings that right human attitude towards the God of holiness and of salvation which is required by the moral nature of things — an attitude which passes from Him into us ; which in Him and even in us pleases God " [1]. Finally, " a third way of seeking to explain Christ's saving sufferings is by reference to an external moral nature-of-things, not as embodied in man's constitution, but as prior to that, though helping to determine that constitution as well as all other things God has made " [2]. We must admit, in conclusion, that, after reading and rereading the fifteen pages of Mackintosh's suggestions for a theory, we sincerely doubt that any of his colleagues will be able to throw any light on the Atonement by basing themselves on the vague and indefinite syncretism which he there proposes.

***

But it is time to quit this domain of conflicting Protestant opinions, and pursue further the Pauline doctrine on the Redemption. The Death of Christ, the Head of the race, because it had reference to the remission of sins, was, as we have shown above, a vicarious satisfaction. Since this satisfaction of our Lord was brought forth amid penal sufferings and a perfect immolation of Himself for God's honor, it was also a sacrifice. As a result of this sacrificial death sin was expiated, God propitiated, and man liberated from the power of Sin, of death, and of the spirit-powers. It is the victory of Christ over these powers, to which humanity was enslaved, that we shall now consider.

---

1. O. c., p. 308.
2. Ibid., p. 309.

C. RANSOM OR REDEMPTION.

(1) *Redemption from Sin.*

Among the different aspects under which Saint Paul presents to us the redeeming work of Christ that of " redemption " or " ransom " is of frequent occurrence. To regard the state of sin as a slavery and the Redemption as a deliverance from this servitude were ideas that easily suggested themselves to the contemporaries of Christ. And the Apostolic letters, in fact, frequently insist that the Christians must not fall back again into the bondage from which they were ransomed by the Blood of Christ [1].

Deissmann in his *Licht vom Osten* [3] has furnished us with many interesting details concerning the customs and technical formulas of the ancient processes of slave-liberation. It is especially the inscriptions of Delphi, the author tells us, which have elucidated the nature of the rites employed in the freeing of slaves. Yet these inscriptions are not merely a Delphic peculiarity, but were common property of the whole Parnassus-district,

---

1. The term ἀπολύτρωσις is used ten times in the New Testament: six times in a somewhat larger sense of salvation.(Lk. XXI, 28 ; Rom. VIII, 23 ; I Cor. I, 30 ; Eph. I, 4, IV, 30 ; Heb. IX, 35), and four times in the sense of ransom (Rom. III, 24 ; Col. I, 14 ; Eph. I, 7 ; Heb. IX, 15). It is a *nomen actionis* of λύτρον (Mk. X, 45 ; I Tim. II, 6). Some expositors attempt to arrive at a definition of the term by isolating it from its context, and treating it as a word study ; in the LXX it is the representative of certain much used Hebrew terms, several of which are rendered by λύτρον. Which of these corresponds most closely to the New Testament usage is a matter of discussion. One of these, כָּפַר (cf. Exod. XXI, 30 ; XXX, 12 ; Num. XXI, 30 ; Job XXXIII, 24 ; Is. XII, 3 ; Amos V, 12) is said to have the root idea of " washing ", or of " effacing ", though it is almost entirely used in an accomodated moral sense of " making propitiation ". The leaning is, therefore, towards sacrificial implications. On the other hand, it may also be regarded as taking the place of some words from the stems פָּדָה (cf. Is. XXXV, 10; Osee XIII, 14 ; Jer. XXXI, 11), or גָּאַל (cf. Is. XXXI, 10 ; Jer. XXXI, 11), and refer to the money payments required under the law to secure the release of persons from slavery. G. Hollman, *Die Bedeutung des Todes Jesu*, p. 98 ff., has sought by an elaborate investigation to discover the Aramaic term of which λύτρον is the equivalent, and concludes that in the Hebrew original the inquiry results more favorably for the idea of " liberating " than of " covering ". Hence whatever line of derivation may be followed, the resultant idea from the Hebrew terms, of which λύτρον is the representative in the LXX, is that the word indicates the means or cost by which a redemption is achieved. Cf. Deissmann, *Licht vom Osten*[3], p. 240 ff., Driver, art. *Propitiation*, HDB, vol. IV, pp. 128-132.

nay, they belonged to Greek antiquity in general. These records, discovered and published by French archeologists, and dating from pre-Christian as well as from New Testament times, have been found at Physkos, Amphissa, Cos, Naupaktos, Chalia, Elateia, Steiris, and Daulis. In what did this usage consist, it might be asked ? Among the different legal forms according to which in antiquity the liberation of a slave could take place, we find the solemn rite of a fictitious purchase of the slave by a god. The former master conducts the slave to the temple, sells him to the deity, and receives from the temple-treasury the purchase money. The inscription of Cos designates this process of liberation by the term ἀπολύτρωσις, while the Oxyrhynchus Papyri, no. 48, 49, and 722, from the years 86, 100, 91-107 A. D., denote the ransom price by the word λύτρον. Once liberated the slave became the property of the divinity, not its temple-slave but rather a protégé. In regard to men and to his former master he was absolutely free, and in many records it is severely forbidden under penalty to reduce the ransomed slave to his former condition [1].

Now it is no doubt probable that Saint Paul, writing to Christian communities where slaves were numerous as e. g. in Corinth, had these conditions in mind when he announced to his converts a new redemption, a liberation from the bondage of sin, of death, and of Satan. From these oppressive powers, he says, we were ransomed by the Blood of Christ : τιμῆς ἠγοράσθητε (I Cor. VI, 20, VII, 23 ; cf. Gal. IV, 5). Again the Apostle says : τῇ ἐλευθερίᾳ ἡμᾶς Χριστὸς ἠλευθέρωσεν (Gal. IV, 31), and ἐπ' ἐλευθερίᾳ ἐκλήθητε (Gal. V, 13). And lest the

1. DEISSMANN, o. c., p. 243 cites the following Delphic inscription, which is interesting for its terminology :

ἐπρίατο ὁ Ἀπόλλων
ὁ Ἠύθιος παρὰ Σωσιβίου
Ἀμφισσέος ἐπ' ἐλευθερίαι
σωμ[α] γυναικεῖον ἄι ὄνομα
Νίκαια τὸ γένος Ῥωμαίαν τιμᾶς
ἀργυρίου μνᾶν τριῶν καὶ
ἡμιμναίου. προαποδότας κατὰ
τὸν νόμον Εὔμναστος
Ἀμφισσεύς. τὰν τιμὰν
ἀπέχει. τὰν δὲ ὠνὰν
ἐπίστευσε Νίκαια τῶι
Ἀπόλλωνι ἐπ' ἐλευθερίαι.

We do not think it necessary to insist here on the immense difference which separated these fictitious liberations from the Redemption which the Apostle announced. The God Who redeemed the Christian payed the ransom with His own Blood, and the liberty which He acquired for him is not that of doing what he pleases, but the liberty of the children of God. Christ's Lordship over the Christians is absolute (I Cor. VIII, 6) ; the pagans on the other hand could acknowledge many gods and many lords.

newly-liberated Christians succumb in the struggle between the flesh and the spirit the Apostle warns the Galatians ἵνα μὴ ἃ ἐὰν θέλητε ταῦτα ποιῆτε (v, 17). He admonishes them against the " false brethren unawares brought in, who come in privately to spy our liberty which we have in Christ Jesus, that they might bring us into servitude " (II, 4) ; they must not be " held again under the yoke of bondage " (v, 1) ; because " you are bought with a price, be not made the bondslaves of men " (I Cor. VII, 23). The Christians are bondsmen of Christ, they have become " servants of God and of justice " (Rom. VI, 22, 18). Hence they must " abide with God " (I Cor. VII, 24), and " attend upon the Lord without impediment " (I Cor. VII, 35).

The name of Redeemer or Ransomer was never applied to our Lord in the New Testament (cf. Rom. XI, 26 ; Acts VII, 35). But the basis of this Apostolic conception is laid in Christ's own declarations, Mk. X, 45 : " For the Son of Man is not come to be ministered unto, but to minister and to give his life a redemption for many " (δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν ; cf. the echo of this statement in I Tim. II, 6 : ὁ δοὺς ἑαυτὸν ἀνπλύτρον ὑπὲρ πάντων). This statement of Saint Mark is elucidated and enforced in Jn. X, 11 : " The good shepherd giveth his life for his sheep ", and in XV, 13 : " Greater love than this no man hath, that a man lay down his life for his friends ". Christ here adduces His example which runs on similar lines as that of Phil. II, 5 ff. He describes His whole mission in the world as one of service, and adverts to His ransoming death as a culminating act of the ministry which He came into the world to perform. He came to deliver from its sins the incredulous and adulterous generation whose chiefs desired His death (Mk. VIII, 38, IX, 19, XII, 1). He speaks of *giving* His life, emphasing thereby the voluntariness of the act (Mk. X, 45 ; I Tim. II, 6 ; Tit. II, 14), and of giving His life as a *ransom*, employing thereby a word used to express the price paid to secure the manumission of slaves or the release of prisoners. An elaboration of this central idea is found in Tit. II, 14 where the concept of ransom intrinsic in Christ's giving Himself for us is carried over to the ultimate effects : " He gave himself for us that he might redeem (λυτρώσηται) us from all iniquity, and might cleanse to himself a people acceptable, a pursuer of good works "

The important passage in which the nature of our redemption is unfolded is in Rom. III, 24 ff. : δικαιούμενοι δωρεὰν τῇ αὐτοῦ χάριτι διὰ τῆς ἀπολυτρώσεως τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. By the transgression of the first parent the whole race became subject to divine wrath, and given over by God under the power and servitude of sin : " All have sinned and do need the glory of God " (Rom. III, 23). By his personal sins man increases this bondage to sin, and left to himself cannot free himself from it. Men being sinners can be justified only gratuitously, by an act of pure grace on God's part. That God, however, can so act towards them in His grace is due to the fact that there is an ἀπολυτρώσις available for them in Christ Jesus, and that this " redemption " was procured by the death of Christ as an expiatory sacrifice, thereby enabling God righteously to forgive.

This representation again meets us in Eph. I, 7 : ἐν ᾧ ἔχομεν τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν διὰ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ, τὴν ἄφεσιν τῶν παραπτωμάτων κατὰ τὸ πλοῦτος τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ, and also in Col. I, 13, 14 : ὅς ἐρύσατο ἡμᾶς ἐκ τῆς ἐξουσίας τοῦ σκότους καὶ μετέστησεν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ υἱοῦ τῆς ἀγάπης αὐτοῦ, ἐν ᾧ ἔχομεν τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν, τὴν ἄφεσιν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν. This ransoming, this ἀπολύτρωσις, which is in Christ, is described with more particularity in Ephesians as having been procured " through his Blood ", and is in both passages identified with the remission of sins (cf. I Cor. VI, 20). It is because Christ has at the cost of His Blood i. e. by voluntarily dying for us, purchased for us remission of sins, which is our ransoming, that we have deliverance from the tyranny of darkness and are transferred into the kingdom of the Son of God's love. We thus reach a very close determination of the exact point at which the ransoming act of Christ operates and the exact evil from which it immediately relieves us: it liberates us from the guilt and penal consequences of sin, and only through this relief does it secure for us liberation from the spirit-powers and from the Law [1].

1. For a study of the term λύτρον in Mc. X, 25 and Mtt. XX, 28, cf. MEDEBIELLE, art. *La vie donnée en rançon*, Biblica, 1923, pp. 3-40 ; the author after asking whether the rarity of the term does not forbid us to attach much importance to it, concludes, pp. 39-40 : " si l'on peut parler d'isolement à propos de l'expression, qui ne se rencontre en effet qu'une fois dans le NT, il n'en est pas de même de l'idée, qui se rattache intimement à toute la doctrine évangélique et biblique, dont elle est l'aboutissant naturel. Ce terme relie

Sin which interrupted man's friendship with God also deprived him of the power to direct his life to the supernatural end for which he was destined. Besides, through concupiscence which derives from Sin, the latter exercises on the will an impulse more or less irresistible so that if man does not rise to the life of grace by the merits of Christ, he is unable to avoid falling back into new sins. And since death, too, is a sign and a consequence of Sin, man is likewise a slave of death : " Death reigned from Adam unto Moses, even over them also who have not sinned after the similitude of the transgression of Adam " (Rom. v, 14). In a similar way man is enslaved to Satan because the latter is, first of all, a personification of all evil, and because, secondly, through his seductive instigations Sin first entered into the world. By inducing man to sin the devil gained a victory over man's will and turned him from his Supreme Good and final end. Man is unable to pass out off this state and receive sanctifying grace which is necessary for him to attain his final end. It is in this sense that fallen man is a slave of the devil and of sin.

But if this situation of fallen man in regard to sin and to the devil is one of fact it is not one of right. And it is here that the analogy between slavery and the state of sin ceases to exist. The ancient legislation acknowledged and granted to the master rights of property over his slave ; but there can be no question of the rights of sin over man, since sin is something abstract, nor of those of the demon, since his victory over man is essentially illegitimate. If sinners in punishment of their faults are abandoned to the power of the devil who causes them to suffer, this does not constitute the exercise of a right on the part of the demon but the exercise solely of divine justice. Christ by His sacrificial death expiated our sins, propitiated God, vindicated God's intrinsic justice, and thereby liberated us from servitude to Satan. Hence if we desire to push the

---

entre elle les données éparses dans l'évangile sur les péchés des hommes, la justice de Dieu, la mission de Jésus, la nécessité et l'efficacité de ses souffrances ; il applique à l'ordre surnaturel un genre de délivrance bien connu dans la loi mosaïque et il montre dans le Fils de l'homme le héros d'une des prophéties les plus expressives, le véritable Serviteur de Jahvéh ; il consacre les conceptions religieuses populaires sur le rachat des pécheurs par les mérites de l'immolation du juste ; il résume, dans une image saisissante et comprise de tous la doctrine de l'expiation et tout le mystère du salut. Le mot λύτρον se présente dans l'évangile à la manière de la clef de voûte dans l'édifice ".

metaphor further than Saint Paul himself does, it is to be said that the λύτρον or τιμή was paid not to the devil but to God [1].

By this " ransom " or expiatory sacrifice of Christ humanity was freed from the penalty which it incurred by sin, i. e. death, and in Christ was reconciled to God; henceforth God will no longer allow His wrath to weigh over mankind, henceforth the domination of sin to which mankind was enslaved will cease. Being liberated from the power of sin, the Christian is also delivered from the tyranny of the flesh, the vehicle and abode of Sin, the most important and immediate factor of Sin, one through which all the other auxiliaries of sin act upon man. For the death of Christ is not only a death because of sin, περὶ ἁμαρτίας (Rom. VIII, 3), but also a death to sin, τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ ἀπέθανεν ἐφάπαξ, and the passage to a life exclusively dedicated to God, ζῇ τῷ θεῷ (Rom. VI, 10). This death, which Christ underwent in order to repair the disobedience of sin and expiate its penalty, is also that of all Christians. In uniting themselves to the dying Christ, their Head and Chief, they themselves die to sin : " The old man is crucified with Christ that the body of sin may be destroyed, to the end that we may serve sin no longer " (Rom. VI, 6) ; " They that are Christ's ", says Saint Paul, " have crucified the flesh with its vices and its concupiscences " (Gal. V, 24) [2].

1. PRAT, o. c., vol. II[6], p. 231, says : " Si l'on voulait pousser jusqu'au bout la méthaphore, c'est à Dieu lui-même que serait acquitté le prix de notre rachat ; car c'est Dieu que l'œuvre de la rédemption apaise et rend propice et c'est à l'égard de Dieu seul que le Christ est " propitiateur ". Cf. also HUGON, *De Verbo Incarnato et hominum Redemptore*, p. 403, *Le mystère de la rédemption*[3], p. 176 ff., RICHARD, art. *La rédemption, mystère d'amour*, RechSR, October, 1923, p. 414 ff., RIVIÈRE, *Le dogme de la rédemption*, p. 193 ff., POHLE-PREUSS, *Soteriology*[2], p. 51 ff.

2. H. W. CARRÉ in his essay, *Paul's Doctrine of Redemption*, pp. 35, 89, 96, 116, attempts to interpret Saint Paul from the view-point of the latter's philosophy of the world, which is none other, he says, than a certain dualism. Because of an initial catastrophe humanity fell under the control of the powers of evil, among whom the author places Sin, Death, and the Law. Whoever sins allies himself with the enemies of God, and thus exposes himself to the divine wrath both now and especially on the last day. The author finds an epitome of the Apostle's doctrine in I Thess. 1, 10 : " Jesus hath delivered us from the wrath to come ". By His Death Christ broke the strength of these evil powers, and procured for us the means of destroying them in our turn. This display of divine power which is the work of Christ the Saviour, or more exactly the work of God in Christ, is attributed to three principal acts : the Resurrection, the first victory over evil, the Christian life, in which man gradually detaches himself from sin, and the parousia, when death will be definitely overcome and the dominion of God reestablished over His creatures.

Because Christ became obedient even unto death and underwent for us the condemnation decreed against Sin (Rom. VIII, 3), God no longer imputes sin to humanity united to its Chief, and humanity is no longer *redevable* to God for any punishment. Now this punishment of Sin consisted in the penalty of death, which itself implied a privation of the glory of God and exclusion from the Kingdom. This death Christ underwent for us in order to triumph over it in His Resurrection. For us also the death of Christ our Head produces reconciliation, and, consequently, deliverance from the penalty of sin and a readmission to life. But this liberation from death, which is total and complete for the Head of mankind, is only juridical for the new humanity and will become fully effective only at the parousia. For though death was rendered powerless by Jesus Christ it was not completely annihilated. Death still retains some of its former power, and men continue to die even after the Passion. It will be entirely destroyed and exterminated as the last hostile power when in the hour of the resurrection it shall be swallowed up in the supreme triumph of the Redeemer (I Cor. XV, 26, 54, 55). If Jesus Christ wished to render us exactly what we lost in Adam, He would have directly restored to us original immortality. But the plan of Redemption did not consist in returning to us the gifts lost in Adam, but in substituting for them something preferable. Our actual lot is better but different : instead of abolishing the decree of death God offers us a glorious immortality. In waiting for the final triumph our body is mortal because of sin, but death is helpless to guard its prey. The law of death is broken by a superior force, by the " law of the Spirit and of life ", and hence death no longer has power over us [1].

This explanation, needless to say, is one-sided. It considers as the essence of the Redemption that which in reality is its effect in regard to men. The sacrificial death of Christ, which was at the same time an act of supreme love and obedience to God, had primarily a God-ward aspect ; by it Christ our Head repaired the offense against God, expiated our sins, and thereby also vindicated divine justice.

1. But if our union with Christ dying on the Cross has for us juridically the value of deliverance from the consequences of sin, it is our union with the Risen Christ, our participation of His Spirit, which makes this deliverance real and effective. Thus, in the first place, it is the Christian's union with the Exalted Christ which makes his liberation from death complete. The presence of Christ's Spirit in man makes him groan for final redemption (Rom. VIII, 10, 11, 23). But this Spirit who dwells in us is more than a pledge

Another consequence of Christ's sacrificial death, though not the essential and all-important one as Morgan [1] claims, is redemption from the Mosaic Law. By His Death Christ liberated humanity from the tyranny which Sin exercised over it through the flesh, and at the same time delivered the Jews from the yoke of the Law which, as an auxiliary of Sin, served only to increase the empire and domination of the latter ; the Saviour thus rendered salvation accessible to all men, both Jews and Gentiles, without observance of the Law.

(2) *Redemption from the Mosaic Law.*

One of the fundamental points of Saint Paul's gospel, a doctrine which made him an object of hatred to the Judaizers but which filled the pagan world with hope and joy, was his reiterated claim that the Law was abrogated for both Jew and Gentile. Saint Paul who knew the official teaching of the Pharisees better than any of the other Apostles, saw how entirely incompatible was the economy of the Law with that of grace. Hence, with the exception of a few practical condescensions, he proceeded to strike at the very vitals of the Pharisaic pretensions. To the claims of his adversaries that the Law was an essential condition of salvation, Saint Paul opposed his own doctrine that salvation was in and through Christ alone, that by faith in Jesus we obtain that justice to which the Law

---

of future glory ; He is also the instrument of our resurrection, the active agent of our glorification. It is He who gradually and progressively transforms us into the image of the glorious Christ (Rom. VIII, 11 ; II Cor. III, 8). So too, secondly, the tyranny of sin juridically broken by Christ's death does not become effectively so until at His Resurrection when Christ becomes a " vivifying spirit ". It is by union with the Risen Christ that man will have the strength to resist sin, and this force is no other than the divine πνεῦμα which proceeds from the Living Christ. So too it is owing to his incorporation into the Mystic Christ and his participation of Christ's Spirit (Rom. VIII, 2, 4, 9) that the Christian is no longer a slave of his flesh but can mortify its works (Rom. VIII, 13). It is because the Christian lives and walks by the Spirit that he can resist the concupiscences of the flesh and produce the fruits of the Spirit (Gal. V, 16, 25). It is only therefore by a participation of the Spirit of the Risen Christ that the Christian derives this divine antidote to the power of death, sin, and the flesh. From the above it is already evident how essential a role the Resurrection plays in the economy of salvation. Cf. M. FAILLON, art. *Dissertation sur le mystère de la rédemption des hommes par N. S. J. C.*, RCF, 1915, t. 82, pp. 426-446.

1. *The Religion and Theology of Paul*, pp. 73-97.

rendered homage (Rom. III, 21) but which it could not give. To insist on the binding force of the Law was, according to the Apostle, to deny the saving efficacy of Christ's death (Gal. II, 21, V, 11), and to question the sufficiency of the Christian religion (Gal. V, 2). And to retain the Law together with faith in Christ would be to mistake the proper character of the former, since the Law was essentially a provisional and parenthetical institution, which was to disappear once its purpose was accomplished. Against this attempt to make a subordinate system of precepts coexist as obligatory together with Christian faith and practise, Saint Paul directs his most vigorous attacks. The Law, he says, disappeared wholly and entirely because it constituted an imperfect regime which in the " fulness of time " gave place to another more perfect system, a " law " of faith and grace [1].

Some theologians have attempted to explain the redeeming work of Christ wholly in terms of redemption from the Law. This view is upheld by Everett, whose theory, developed in his book, *The Gospel of Paul*, may be briefly summarized as follows : Christ did not suffer the penalty of sin, in fact the immediate reference of His Death was not to sin at all. Its immediate aim and effect was to abrogate the Law, and only in the second place and as the result of the primary effect to bring about remission of sins. For Christ died by crucifixion; but a man crucified by the Jewish Law was " accursed ", i. e., ceremonially unclean. Now, all who believe in the crucified Jesus become partakers of His ceremonial uncleanness, and as such, objects of abhorrence to orthodox Jews, deserving excommunication from synagogue and temple. They were crucified with their Christ and freed from the obligation to keep the Law, for what claim could the Law have on excommunicated

1. In regard to the precise moment of the cessation of the Law, it is certain that the Mosaic Law was not abrogated before the death of Christ. Saint Paul himself says that the old testament ceased only when the new one came into force (Heb. VIII, 8 ff.) ; but this did not take place before Christ's death : " For where there is a testament, the death of the testator must of necessity come in. For a testament is of force, after men are dead, otherwise it is as yet of no strength, whilst the testator liveth " (Heb. IX, 16, 17). The old sacrifices continued till the death of Christ " the Holy Ghost signifying this that the way into the holies was not yet made manifest " (IX, 8), but by His Death Christ " dedicated for us a new and living way through the veil, that is to say, his flesh " (X, 20). The Law therefore obliged the Jews up to the death of Christ, and hence we see also that Christ Himself not only observed the

men ? And since the Law is cancelled for them, the pardon of sin followed, for sin is not imputed where there is no law. The theory as is evident rests on two texts in the Epistle to the Galatians, III, 13, and II, 19-20.

Whatever may be said of the above construction it is certain that a study of the early history of the Church renders it untenable. If ceremonial uncleanness was a necessary result of Christian faith, then all believers would have been forthwith cast out of the synagogue. But we do not find the early Jewish Christians conscious of any such rupture with the Temple. Again, if the above view were true, there should have been no Judaistic party, no controversy about the perpetual obligation of the Law. Christians would have been compelled to understand their position by the treatment they received from unbelieving Jews. Finally, how was it that so few understood that to be a believer in Jesus was to be outside the commonwealth, dead to the Law and free from its claims, and that Saint Paul had to fight so hard a battle to gain for such ideas currency or even toleration within the Church ?

To illustrate his teaching that the Law of Moses was abrogated by the death of Christ, Saint Paul cites an analogy from the law of marriage (Rom. VII, 1-3). The marriage bond, says the Apostle, is dissolved only by death, and hence a married woman is bound by the law to her husband as long as he lives. A second marriage of the wife becomes lawful, therefore, only when the husband dies: " Known you not brethren, (for I speak to them that know the law), that the law hath dominion over a man as long as he liveth. For the woman that hath a husband whilst her husband liveth is bound to the law of her husband.

---

ceremonies (Mtt. XXVI, 17 ff.) but also recommended their observance to others (Mtt. VIII, 4 ; XXIII, 2, 3). Says ST. THOMAS, I^a, II^{ae}, q. 103, a. 3, ad 2 : " Et ideo ante passionem Christi, Christo praedicante et miracula faciente, currebant simul lex et evangelium, quia jam erat mysterium Christi inchoatum sed nondum consummatum ". When our Lord says that " the law and the prophets were until John ; from that time the kingdom of God is preached, and every one useth violence towards it ", He is not speaking of the cessation of the old law but of a new spirit that was coming into force. On the other hand it is clear from the Pauline Epistles that the obligation of the Law did not endure beyond Christ's death (Rom. VII, 1-6). In comparing the Law to the matrimonial bond the Apostle supposes that the obligations of the Law ceased by the death of Christ. Furthermore, Saint Paul always assigns the death of Christ as the cause of the abrogation of the Law (Gal. II, 19, 20 ; Eph. II, 15, 16 ; Col. II, 14 ; Heb. IX, 15).

But if her husband be dead, she is loosed from the law. Therefore whilst her husband liveth, she shall be called an adulteress if she be with another man, but if her husband be dead, she is delivered from the law, so that she is not an adulteress, if she be whith another man " (Rom. VII, 1-3).

The above analogy is somewhat involved and consequently difficult of application. The Apostle does not argue, as might be expected, that we are liberated from the Law because the Law is dead, since he would thereby be assuming its abrogation. So he says that the Christians, who were formerly wedded, so to say, to the Law of Moses and bound to it, died to the Law in the mystical death of baptism in which they were united to the dying Christ who by His death abrogated the Law. " Therefore ", says the Apostle, " you also are become dead to the law by the body of Christ, that you may belong to another, who is risen again from the dead, that we may bring forth fruit to God. For when we were in the flesh, the passions of sins, which were by the law, did work in our members to bring forth fruit unto death. But now we are loosed from the law of death wherein we were detained, so that we should serve in newness of spirit and not in the oldness of the letter " (Rom. VII, 4-6). By the same death whereby we died to Sin, we also died to the Law, the power of Sin (I Cor. XV, 56) ; and just as we were liberated from the service of Sin that we might henceforth live unto justice (Rom. VI, 18) so also were we freed from the servitude of the Law by our mystical death that we might serve Christ (Rom. VI, 11, 13, 22) [1].

1. Saint Paul's use of an analogy from the law of marriage to illustrate his teaching concerning the abrogation of the Law by the death of Christ has given rise to many different explanations of the comparison. According to PRAT, o. c., vol. I[9], pp. 269-270 :

" La femme = le *moi*, immuable dans ses divers états.
Le mari = le vieil homme qui asservit le *moi*.
La loi du mari = le péché inhérent au vieil homme.
La mort du mari = le baptême, mort au vieil homme.
Le nouveau mariage = l'union avec le Christ ".

According to SANDAY AND HEADLAM, *Epistle to the Romans*[5], p. 172 :

" The Wife = the true self or ego, which is permanent through all change.
The (first) Husband = the old state before conversion to Christianity.
The ' law of the husband ' = the law which condemned that old state.
The new Marriage = the union upon which the convert enters with Christ ".

CORNELY, *Ad Romanos*, p. 348, establishes a still closer *rapprochement* in that he supposes the mystical death of the wife : " Quia nimirum vir et mulier sunt una caro, uno moriente commoritur alter, utique non physice, sed secun-

Baptism, as we have said above, is a mystical death (Rom. VI, 1) in which we die to the Law (Rom. VII, 1-4). This death is brought about necessarily by the very terms of the Law: "Through the law", says Saint Paul, "I am dead to the law", διὰ νόμου νόμῳ ἀπεθάνον (Gal. II, 19). The Law which did not give the strength and force for the accomplishment of what it commanded, compelled the Apostle to look for justice outside the Law, i. e. it drove him to Christ. By his union to Christ crucified the Apostle died to the Law: "With Christ I am nailed to the cross" (Gal. II, 19). This death took place ideally on Calvary and effectively at baptism.

Besides this death of the Christian to the Law and the natural cessation of the Law when its purpose had been accomplished, there is another and violent abrogation of the Law which Saint Paul twice describes with striking vividness and energy. In the Epistle to the Colossians where the Apostle proposes to establish Christian liberty under the unique mediation of Christ, the Law is represented as an odious yoke crushing the Jew by its intolerable burdens. The Colossians, says Saint Paul, when they were dead in their tresspasses and alienation from God of which the uncircumcision of their flesh was a symbol, God quickened into life with Christ and forgave them all their offenses. Then and there also God "blotting out the handwriting of the decree that was against us and which was contrary to us, hath taken the same out of the way fastening it to the cross (καὶ ὑμᾶς νεκροὺς ὄντας τοῖς παραπτώμασιν καὶ τῇ ἀκροβυστίᾳ τῆς σαρκὸς ὑμῶν συνεζωοποίησεν ὑμᾶς σὺν αὐτῷ, χαρισάμενος ἡμῖν πάντα τὰ παραπτώματα, ἐξαλείψας τὸ καθ' ἡμῶν χειρόγραφον τοῖς δόγμασιν ὃ ἦν ὑπεναντίον ἡμῖν, καὶ αὐτὸ ἦρκεν ἐκ τοῦ μέσου, προσηλώσας αὐτὸ τῷ σταυρῷ, Col. II, 13, 14). A χειρόγραφον is properly an authograph and was used in later Greek as a technical term for a written

dum suam relationem ad alterum. 'Cum viro moriente commoritur uxor, quatenus uxor est, neque tam viri morte physica, quam sua ipsius morte ut ita dicamus mystica juxta Paulum a lege viri liberatur, i. e. a lege, quae ad maritum pertinet de eoque lata est, seu a lege matrimoniali qua uni illi viro alligata erat per totam suam vitam conjugalem".

Whatever may be said of the above explanations, it is clear that the fundamental idea involved in both the analogy and the application is the fact that the binding force of the law ceases by death; in the former a person is freed from the law by the death of the other, by that of the husband, while in the latter the Christians having died mystically are eo ipso free. Cf. LAGRANGE, *Épître aux Romains*, p. 160 ff.

acknowledgment of debt, or for a bond or obligation having the " sign manual " of the debt or contractor. In the passage above it is used of the Mosaic Law, viewed formally as consisting in a plurality of precepts (τοῖς δόγμασιν — v. 20), which, being unfulfilled, is analogous to an unpaid " note of hand ". However in this case the χειρόγραφον was not written by the debtor, nor is it necessary to suppose that the Apostle had in view the assent of the Jewish people, or in the case of the Gentiles the assent of conscience to the moral law [1]. The fact of obligation is sufficient to justify the use of the figure. The χειρόγραφον was directly opposed to the Jews in so far as it imposed upon them numerous and rigorous duties and exposed them in case of violation to severe penalties. It was equally " contrary " to the Gentiles because it isolated them in their abandonment and excluded them from the theocracy. But God blotted out and effaced this " handwriting ", and by nailing it to the Cross of His Son removed it out of the way and out of sight forever [2]. On the Cross then the Law ended its dramatic career ; hence Saint Paul triumphantly concludes that from now on no man has any right to " judge you in meat or in drink, or in respect of a festival day, or of the new moon, or of the sabbaths, which are a shadow of things to come, but the body is of Christ " (Col. II, 16, 17).

In the Epistle to the Ephesians Saint Paul represents the abrogation of the Law as a cessation of discords and as a token of unity between the two great sections of humanity. Formerly the Gentiles, when they were without Christ, were, as the Apostle says, contemptuously called the Uncircumcision by the so-called Circumcision ; they were estranged from the theocratic constitution of Israel and from the covenant of the promise,

1. Thus LIGHTFOOT, *Epistle to the Colossians*, p. 187, says : " In the case before us the Jewish people might be said to have signed the contract when they bound themselves by a curse to observe all the enactments of the Law (Dt. XXVII, 14-26 ; cf. Exod. XXIV, 3) ; and the primary reference would be to them. But ἡμῖν, ἡμῶν, seem to include Gentiles as well as Jews, so that a wider reference must be given to the expression. The δόγματα therefore, though referring primarily to the Mosaic ordinances, will include all forms of positive decrees in which moral or social principles are embodied or religious duties defined ; and the ' bond ' is the moral assent of the conscience, which (as it were) signs and seals the obligation ".

2. It has been supposed that in some cities the abrogation of a decree was signified by running a nail through it and hanging it up in public. The image would thus gain force, but we have no historical evidence for such a custom. Cf. also PRAT, o. c., vol. II[6], pp. 269-277.

having no hope and being in the deepest stage of heathen misery (Eph. II, 11, 12). They were separated from the Jews in every respect, and the mutual hostility which reigned between the two increased this distance. But now being united to Christ Jesus, the Gentiles are one with the Jews, they are no longer strangers and sojourners but fellow-citizens of the saints and of the household of God, having attained to peace with both God and the Jews (Eph. II, 13, 14, 17, 19 ; cf. Is. LVII, 19 ; Mich. V, 4). For He who is our peace united both Jews and Gentiles into one body and raised them to the nobility of the true Israel, having in His flesh done away with the middle wall of partition, namely, the enmity, annulling the law of commandments expressed in decrees, that He might make the two in Himself into one man (Αὐτὸς γὰρ ἐστιν ἡ εἰρήνη ἡμῶν, ὁ ποιήσας τὰ ἀμφότερα ἕν καὶ τὸ μεσότοιχον τοῦ φραγμοῦ λύσας, τὴν ἔχθραν ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ αὐτοῦ τὸν νόμον τῶν ἐντολῶν ἐν δόγμασιν καταργήσας ἵνα τοὺς δύο κτίσῃ ἐν αὐτῷ εἰς ἕνα καινὸν ἄνθρωπον ποιῶν εἰρήνην, Eph. II, 14-15). The wall of partition [1], the separation, religious, moral, and social, which forbade fellowship between Jew and Gentile, was definitely broken down by the annulling of the Law. Henceforth there would be only one family, the Church, the mystic body of Christ.

The Mosaic Law, it might be noted in this connection, was essentially a national institution. It was at once the civil and religious, the moral, social, and family code of the Jews. Throughout it was limited to the Jews, an Oriental people, and was neither adapted nor intended ever to become a universal law. To some extent it served as a barrier to keep the Jew from the defiling contact of paganism, while certain nations and individuals were formally excluded (cf. Dt. XXIII, 1, 8 ; VII, 1, 6). Some of its institutions as circumcision and the laws

1. According to ABBOTT, *Ephesians and Colossians*, p. 61, " It seems probable that the figure was suggested by the partition which separated the Court of the Gentiles from the temple proper, and on which there was an inscription threatening death to any alien who passed it. That the Ephesian readers can hardly be supposed to be familiar with the arrangements of the temple is no proof that these may not have been in the apostle's mind. But it is worth noticing that it was an Ephesian, Trophimus, that St. Paul was charged with bringing into the temple. A more serious objection seems to be, that when the Epistle was written the wall was still standing. But the apostle is not speaking of the literal wall, but using it as an illustration ". Cf. GORE, *St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians*, p. 104 ff.

of clean and unclean foods were of such a character that they could not be imposed upon all peoples.

Hence Saint Paul, an admirer as he was of the sacred traditions of his nation, soon realized that it was impossible to impose the Law on converts from paganism, and that the Law would prove an insurmountable barrier to the conversion of the Gentile world. Even the decision of the Council of Jerusalem — that the Gentile converts are not bound by the Law but that the Jewish Christians should observe it (Acts xv, 23, 24) — was only a temporary compromise. For if the Law should be obligatory on some of the Christians, the unity of the Church would be an impossibility. There would have been a Jewish and a Gentile Christianity. Between the two no intercourse and contact would have been possible since the Jewish Christians would necessarily regard the Gentile Christians as pagans and any relation with them would involve defilement. Mutual animosity and recriminations would have been the eternal destiny of the Church, and scenes such as that of Antioch (Gal. II, 11, 16) would have been a daily occurrence. The Law would have proved a perpetual " middle wall of partition " (Eph. II, 14).

Our study of the Law has thus brought us to two conceptions of its abrogation. On the one hand Saint Paul represents the Law as a provisional institution which by multiplying sin was to lead man to acknowledge his helplessness before God ; he describes it as a transitory phase in the divine plan of salvation destined to prepare the way for the promises and for Christ. The Law, says the Apostle, was set because of transgressions " until the seed should come to whom the promises were made in Abraham " (Gal. III, 19) ; it was our pedagogue and tutor until Christ, " unto that faith which was to be revealed " (Gal. III, 24, IV, 1 ff.) ; in fact, " the end of the law is Christ, unto justice to every one that believeth " (Rom. x, 4). Yet on the other hand Saint Paul says that the Law did not give place to the new economy before it had first obtained satisfaction, before Christ paid the penalty of death to which man was subject because of his transgressions (Gal. III, 13, IV, 4; Col. II, 14 ; Eph. II, 14). Are we then in the presence of two different and contradictory view-points in regard to the same question ? In the solution of this apparent difficulty it is to be noted that if Saint Paul represents Christ as paying a

penalty to the Law, this is owing to the fact that the Apostle personified not only Sin itself but also the factors of Sin. In fact the punishment inflicted by the Law on its transgressors is the Jewish manner of representing the punishment inflicted by God on sinners. The Law, besides fulfilling a negative role in the divine plan, could at the same time be a manifestation of the will of God, and as such, just and holy, constituting its violators sinners before God. Hence on the one hand it could be destined to disappear naturally with the coming of Christ, and yet on the other hand be regarded as not ceasing before it had obtained satisfaction and expiation of its transgressions.

The teaching of Saint Paul concerning the abrogation of the Law is completed by a Scriptural allegory. One of the most powerful claims of the Jews with which the Apostle had to contend, one which seemed to be based on Scripture itself, was the perpetuity of the Law. This Pharisaic pretention Saint Paul set aside by maintaining that the Law was a pedagogue, a temporary institution, which was to disappear with the coming of Christ. Although this argument was decisive for the Christians, the Apostle now attempts to find a *point d'appui* against the Law in Scripture itself.

The Apostle finds that in the designs of God there was not one, unique, and perpetual dispensation, but two dispensations, the one imperfect, that of slaves, and the other, that of sons, to which the former was to cede. Hence to the Jews, who vaunted their submission to the Law, Saint Paul proposes from Scripture an illustration from the case of Agar and Sara and their sons, whose destiny was so shaped by Providence that they may be regarded as types of the two dispensations, of Judaism and of Christianity (Gal. IV, 21-31).

Abraham, according to Scripture, says Saint Paul, had two sons : Ishmael, born of a bondwoman Agar, and Isaac, the son of a freewoman Sara. The child of the bondwoman came into the world in the common course of nature, while the son of the freewoman was born in virtue of a promise. Now this twofold progeny represents the two testaments, the carnal and the spiritual Israel, the Synagogue and the Church. Agar was a slave-woman — the Synagogue is a slave to the Law ; Agar gave birth to a son in Arabia — the Jewish religion was born on Mount Sinai in Arabia where God promulgated His Law ; Ishmael, following the condition of his mother, was a slave —

the Jewish nation is enslaved to the Law and is symbolized by the city of Jerusalem, the center of Judaism, which is in bondage to the Law. On the other hand, Sara was a free woman — so too the Church is freed from the Law ; being barren, she gave birth not in a natural way, but in virtue of a divine promise — Christians inherit the heavenly Jerusalem not in virtue of carnal descent from the father of the faithful but in virtue of God's promise. As the earthly Jerusalem is the mother of the Jews, so the heavenly Jerusalem is the mother of Christians. As Sara was barren until the word of promise came, so also this heavenly Jerusalem was practically uninhabited, but with the coming of Christ its population has grown by leaps and bounds. Just as Isaac was persecuted by Ishmael, so too the Christians, the spiritual Israel, to whom God has promised the heavenly inheritance, are persecuted by the Jews. But as Agar and her son were expelled from the household of Abraham and dispossessed of all claims to his inheritance, so also God deprived the Synagogue of its claim to the inheritance and conferred it upon the Christians (Gal. IV, 21-31).

The Law then was abrogated entirely [1], that is, not only in respect to the ceremonial but also in respect to the judicial and moral precepts. From the moment of Christ's Death the Law obliges no one (Gal. III, 19, 28, V, 6 ; Eph. II, 15 ; Heb. VIII, 13). As to the cessation of the ceremonial ordinances Saint Paul is absolutely clear : " Let no man therefore judge you in meat or in drink, or in respect of a festival day, or of the new moon, or of the sabbaths, which are a shadow of things to come, but the body is of Christ " (Col. II, 16, 17 ; cf. Gal. III, 24 ; V, 1). As to the judicial precepts the Apostle implicitly teaches that these were abrogated in so far as he maintains that the whole Law ceased (Eph. II, 14, 15 ; Rom. VII, 4). So too, since circumcision whereby man became " a debtor to do the whole law " has no more force, eo ipso the Law itself has ceased to exercise its claims (Gal. V, 3). Moreover, by the fact that the kingdom of Christ comprises all nations without distinction, the Jews as a peculiar people of God have ceased to exist, and hence also the judicial laws, whereby the nation

1. Cf. LAGRANGE, *Épître aux Galates*, Int. p. LXXI, *Épître aux Romains*, pp. 180-188, GRAFE, *Die Paulinische Lehre vom Gesetz*[2], p. 19 ff.

was governed politically, are no longer binding. And the same may be said of the moral precepts. The Law from the very beginning was given solely for the Jewish people and kingdom (cf. Exod. XII, 43, XIX, 5 ; Dt. IV, 6, V, 1, VII, 2, 6 ; Rom. II, 14, III, 1, 2 ; Eph. II, 14, 15 ; Gal. IV, 24) ; hence when the Mosaic kingdom ceased the Law *ipso facto* was annulled. The moral precepts of the Law in so far as they are binding on Christians, are obligatory not because they were a part of the Mosaic legislation, but because they belong to the natural law and to the law of Christ.

Since the Law is abolished wholly and without distinction, on what basis,we might here ask, will the obligations of the new economy rest ? One might indeed attempt to reconstruct on the ruins of the Torah a new code which would be nothing more than the natural law illuminated in its obscure points by divine revelation. But this system, however ingenious it might be, would not have the approbation of Saint Paul. For although he recognizes the existence of the natural law, he does not give to this interior norm the name of " law ", because law for him is the expression of a positive will. Besides he would not admit that the Christian liberated from the Law retrogrades into a state of nature [1].

The Christian, according to Saint Paul, depends on a higher law, namely, the law of Christ ((Rom. VIII, 2 ; Gal. VI, 2 ; I Cor. IX, 21). This law is a law of grace (Rom. VI, 14), of charity (Rom. VIII, 15), and of liberty (Gal. V, 1, 13, 14), because it enables us to perform what it commands and thereby liberates us from the Sin to which we were enslaved under the old Law. This new law, impressed on our hearts by the Holy Spirit (Rom. V, 5 ; VIII, 7), is established on a twofold foundation. Firstly, it is based on the positive will of God, proclaimed by Christ, promulgated by the Apostle, and freely accepted by the neophyte in the first act of faith and in baptism (Rom. XII, 2; Eph. V, 17, VI, 6 ; I Thess. V, 18). In the light of the Gospel revelation we thus see that the moral part of the Mosaic Law and the natural law become in a more perfect and complete form the positive law of the Christian (cf. Mtt. V ; Phil. IV, 8, 9). In his Epistles Saint Paul frequently makes allusion to the

1. Cf. PRAT, o. c., vol. II[6], p. 375 ff., PESCH, *Praelectiones dogmaticae*[5], vol. V, pp. 332-345, MIGNE, *Scripturae sacrae cursus completus*, vol. II, pp. 55-56. ABBOTT, o. c., p. 64.

supernatural moral law contained in the Apostolic catechesis, and calls it by various names such as " ways " (I Cor. IV, 17), " precepts " (I Thess. IV, 1, 2), " tradition " (II Thess. III, 6), " doctrine " (Rom. XVI, 17), terms, which no doubt suggested a concrete idea to the neophyte.

Secondly, the new law is based on our mystic incorporation into Christ. In baptism the Christian is regenerated and becomes a new being with new rights and obligations (Eph. II, 10, 15 ; Rom. VI, 3-6 ; Gal. II, 20). From this new nature received at baptism flow four new relations : that of filiation in regard to the Father, of consecration to the Holy Spirit, of mystic identity with Christ, and of solidarity between the members of Christ. To these four privileges correspond four new categories of duties, namely, that of gratitude, love, and confidence towards the Father (Rom. VIII, 15-17), of not saddening or extinguishing the Spirit or profaning His holy temple (Eph. IV, 30 ; I Cor. III, 16-17 ; I Thess. V, 19), of modelling and transforming ourselves unto Christ and imitating Him (Rom. XIII, 14 ; Gal. II, 20 ; II Cor. III, 18 ; Eph. IV, 15), and of charity, justice, and collaboration for the general good of our fellow-members in Christ (Rom. XII, 4-5 ; I Cor. XII, 12-27 ; Eph. IV, 12-16 ; Col. II, 19). Hence the liberty of the children of God is not license, and the deliverance from the yoke of the Law not exemption from all restraint (Gal. V, 13).

To the redemption from Sin, from the flesh, and from the Law, we may also add the deliverance from the spirit-powers, and especially from the angel-promulgators and guardians of the Law. For with the disappearance of the legal economy to which men were debtors by reason of their transgressions, the domination of these powers came to an end.

(3) *Redemption from the Spirit-Powers.*

By His redeeming Death Jesus Christ gave a deadly blow to the domination of Satan. By rendering Sin, the flesh, and death, powerless, Christ deprived Satan of his principal means of operation. Hence the ground for all disorder in the world is removed, and a new aeon is brought about in which all powers must again be subjected to Christ : " God raised Christ up from the dead, and set him on his right hand in the heavenly

places, above all principality, and power, and virtue, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come. And he hath subjected all things under his feet " (Eph. I, 20-22 ; Phil. II, 10) [1].

The Christian, it is true, has still to struggle against these powers : " Put you on the armour of God ", says the Apostle, " that you may be able to stand against the deceits of the devil. For our wrestling is not against flesh and blood, but against principalities and powers, against the rulers of the world of this darkness, against the spirits of wickedness in the high places " (Eph. VI, 11, 12). But whosoever is united to Christ is freed from this aeon (Col. I, 13), and no evil spirit can do him harm (Rom. VIII, 38). The grace of Christ, faith, and prayer, are weapons with which Satan can be wounded and overcome (II Cor. XII, 8 ; Eph. VI, 16). Only there where men willingly remain under his power or subject themselves to him anew, can Satan cause evil (II Cor. IV, 3 ff.) [2]. But all of Satan's wiles will eventually be in vain, for he will be abolished together with his associates. In Antichrist he will celebrate, it is true, his triumph, but this will be of short duration. When Christ shall appear on the last day He shall annihilate Satan and his angels " with the spirit of his mouth, and destroy them with the brightness of his coming " (II Thess. II, 8). The

1. JONES art. *St. Paul and the Angels*. Exp., May, 1918, p. 368, maintains that the Apostle seems to be inconsistent in his doctrine of the two, aeons : " In the matter of the two ages ", he says, " the Apostle vacillates between two ideas. In one sense the new age has already arrived and they that are in Christ have been translated out of the evil world of darkness into the kingdom of light. Christians are in virtue of their union with Christ " children of light ". This is much the more frequent idea in the Epistles. At other times St. Paul pictures the new age as still in the future when Christ shall appear in glory and " when he shall have abolished all rule and all authority and power ". This seems to be the view that he takes in Romans VIII, 18 ". But this opinion seems to be incorrect. The opposition which the Apostle establishes is not between a present and a future aeon but between a pre-Christian age and an age in which man is united to Christ. Thus he says, e. g. in Col. I, 13 : " God hath delivered us from the power of darkness and hath translated us into the kingdom of the Son of his love " ; Eph. V, 8 : " You were heretofore darkness, but now light in the Lord " ; II Cor. VI, 14 : " Bear not the yoke with unbelievers. What fellowship hath light with darkness ? " In this new age the Christian is still subject to the attacks of Satan which however with the aid of the Spirit he can successfully resist. Satan's empire will be definitively abolished only in the final triumph of Christ.

2. Cf. HUGON, *Le mystère de la rédemption*[3], pp. 189, 203 ff.

sentence of condemnation will be pronounced upon them, and forthwith pass definitively into force: " Afterwards the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God and the Father, when he shall have brought to nought all principality, and power, and virtue " (I Cor. xv, 24).

It is especially in the Epistle to the Galatians and in that to the Colossians that we find further detailed information concerning the spirit-powers. According to Saint Paul angelic agency was under the Old Testament dispensation a distinguishing feature of God's government of the world. The old world of Judaism, as distinguished from the αἰὼν μέλλον which had come with Christ, was under the rule of angels. They were the intermediaries in the communication of God's will to men. Through their instrumentality the Law was given (Gal. III, 19), — and this is mentioned by the Apostle to prove the temporary character of the Law and its inferiority as a legal system when compared with the dispensation of the promise which came directly from God to men. But the abolition of the Law meant the displacement of the angels from the position which they had formerly held. In the economy of the Spirit which had succeeded to that of the Law men have direct access to God as sons, and the function and religious significance of these angel-promulgators has ceased.

It was not till the necessity arose of dealing with the Colossian heresy that Saint Paul had occasion to speak of the bearing of Christ's work on the angels and of their altered relations to men in consequence of the Cross. While formerly the angels were only occasionally mentioned, here they occupy a prominent position. The Epistle to the Colossians warns its readers against certain false teachers who proposed doctrines irreconcilable with Christian faith. They apparently denied to Christ His supreme position over all creatures, and reduced Him to the rank of created angel-spirits, whom in turn they unduly extolled and made mediators between God and man. Sharing the belief that the angels had given the Law and as its guardians had power to inflict punishment on those who transgressed it, these gnostic Essenes represented obedience to its commandments as being a direct service to the angels, and an acknowledgment of their rights over men [1]. Hence the Apostle was

1. Cf. KURZE, *Der Engels- und Teufelsglaube des Apostels Paulus*, p. 111 ff., LIGHTFOOT, *Epistle to the Colossians*[5], pp. 73-113.

forced to enter upon Christ's relation to the κόσμος and to the spirit-world belonging to the κόσμος. In no letter, consequently, are Christology and angelology so closely united as in the Epistle to the Colossians.

The Apostle tells us that there is no mediator between God and man except the Son of God. The teaching of the false doctors concerning angelic mediators, had, as we noted before, a twofold bearing; it was intimately connected at once with cosmogony and with religion. Saint Paul correspondingly represents the mediatorial function of Christ as twofold: it is exercised in the natural as well as in the spiritual order. In the World as in the Church Christ holds a position of absolute priority and sovereignty. By His agency the world of matter was created and is sustained; He is at once the efficient, exemplary, and final cause of the universe (Col. I, 15-17). Nor is His office in the spiritual world less complete (Col. I, 18-20); In the Church as in the Universe He is sole, supreme, and absolute. And this supremacy is His because it was the Father's good pleasure that in Him all plenitude both of being and of graces should have its permanent abode, (Col. I, 19, II, 9; cf. John I, 14). Through Christ's mediation God restored all things to their primitive harmony, and through the Blood of His Cross He reconciled among themselves all things, whatsoever and wheresoever they be, whether on the earth or in the heavens. In Christ all things find their common end and center of gravitation, through Him all things are pacified and restored to their primitive unity.

By Adam's sin all creatures deviated from their end as established at creation. The evil powers opposed the creative will of the Son by forcing the human race into sin and death. Man disturbed his right relation to Christ by consenting to the evil designs of Satan. As a result of Adam's transgression even irrational creation became out of joint and at cross-purposes with its Maker and with its original destiny (Rom. VIII, 19-22). In fact, the state of even the good angels was altered; for on account of the self-will of creatures the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity during the Old Testament dispensation withdrew from men, and remained unknown the whole period preceding the Redemption. Whenever God gave revelations to men it was through the ministry of angels as mediators (cf. Gal. III, 19), although this was not the original order of creation.

Hence it was the Father's will to subject anew all things to Christ. On the Cross Christ annulled sin and death, and thereby removed the essential causes of disorder in the world. Furthermore, in view of the close connection which the Apostle establishes between sin and the power of demons, man's deliverance from sin was really a liberation from these evil agencies and from their dominion over human souls. Similarly, while formerly Saint Paul taught that Christ had delivered men from the Law, he now changes his words and represents Christ as having, in the act of setting aside the Law, freed us at the same time from the angelic powers ; for in tyrannizing over men through the Law the power of these angelic guardians amounted practically to an incitement to sin. It is not probable however that Saint Paul regarded the " principalities and powers ", of which God divested Himself in the death of Christ (Col. II, 15), as malignant powers. These angels, who were deprived of the authority which they formerly exercised, are represented in the same Epistle as being within the scope of Christ's reconciling love and as being included within that harmony of all things which is the end of Christ's work [1].

This universal reconciliation and restoration of all things in and by Christ is pregnantly summed up in two well-known passages of the Pauline Epistles : Col. I, 19-20 : " In him, it hath well pleased the Father, that all fulness should dwell, and through him to reconcile all things unto himself, making peace through the blood of his cross, both as to the things that are on earth, and the things that are in heaven " (ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ εὐδοκήσεν πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα κατοικῆσαι καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ ἀποκαταλλάξαι τὰ πάντα εἰς αὐτόν, εἰρηνοποιήσας διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ σταυροῦ αὐτοῦ, δι' αὐτοῦ εἴτε τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς εἴτε τὰ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς) ; Eph. I, 9-10 : " His grace hath superabounded in us in all wisdom and prudence, that he might make known unto us the mystery of his will, according to his good pleasure, which he hath purposed in him, in the dispensation of the fulness of times, to re-establish all things in Christ, that are in heaven and on earth " (γνωρίσας ἡμῖν τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ, κατὰ τὴν εὐδοκίαν αὐτοῦ, ἣν προέθετο ἐν αὐτῷ

1. Cf. PRAT, art. *Le triomphe du Christ sur les principautés et les puissances*, RechSR, 1912, pp. 201-229 LEMONNYER, *Épîtres de saint Paul*, vol. II, p. 61, DURAND, art. *Le Christ " premier-né "*, RechSR, 1910, pp. 56-66.

εἰς οἰκονομίαν τοῦ πληρώματος τῶν καιρῶν, ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι τὰ πάντα ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ, τὰ ἐπί τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς) [1].

In both of these passages God is said to take the initiative, and all things are done according to His wisdom and good-will. The divine plan passing beyond our sphere embraces the inhabitants of heaven as well as those of earth. The God-Man, Christ, is the unique mediator of peace and reconciliation by His Blood. In both texts there is insinuated a return to the primitive state when harmony was not yet troubled. This universal reconciliation serves as a prelude to the special reconciliation of the pagans with God and to the admission of the Gentiles to form with the Jews one mystic body. Hence just as the eternal Preexistent Word is the principle of all creation, so also the Incarnate Word is the principle of the whole supernatural order of reparation ; on the cosmological order of creation is superposed the soteriological order of reconciliation and grace (cf. Col. I, 15-17, 18-20) [2].

The redeeming Death whereby Christ procured for us the blessings which we have described above, has for its essential complement the Resurrection. Jesus Christ Himself seldom spoke of His Death without coupling with it the prediction of His Resurrection. In his discourse recorded in the Acts St. Peter assumes it as a self-evident fact that death could not exercise its sway over Christ. And Saint Paul constantly speaks of the Resurrection as a necessary sequel of the Crucifixion and directly connects it with justification. The Death of Christ, it is true, was the inaugural act of a new economy

1. LIDGETT, *The Spiritual Principle of the Atonement*, p. 389, maintains that the relationship of mankind to the Son and His office in regard to it, grounded as these are in the relationship of the Son to the Father, were foreordained apart from sin and actualised in creation. The office of the Son in Atonement is consequential to His office in creation and to the eternal headship out of which that creative office arose. " That the Son should undertake the work of salvation followed naturally from the relationship in which He stood to mankind through creation, and it was as impossible that atonement and redemption should take place without Him, as author, as that creation should have come about without His activity ". To us it seems that while we may advance reasons *ex convenientia* to show why the Son should have been the Redeemer we cannot offer apodictic arguments.

2. Cf. VOSTÉ, *Commentarius in epistolam ad Ephesios*, p. 105 ff., D'ALÈS, art. *La doctrine de la récapitulation en saint Irénée*, RechSR, 1916, pp. 185-211 , PRAT, o. c., vol. II[6], p. 107 ff.

in which the relations between God and man have essentially changed. But while the Death of Christ was the meritorious cause of this new state of mankind, His Resurrection is its active principle. Saint Paul describes this new life, into which believers are introduced through union with the Risen Lord, by saying that he possesses the πνεῦμα of Jesus Christ (Rom. VIII, 9), that the Spirit of Christ, or the Spirit of God mediated through the Exalted Christ, dwells in him (Rom. VIII, 11), or that Christ Himself dwells in him so that he can say : " I live now not I, but Christ liveth in me " (Gal. II, 20). The life then which he now lives has the Lord as its central determining principle ; the ζωή of the believer is the very ζωή of the Exalted Christ (Rom. VIII, 10 ; II Cor. IV, 10). " A man in Christ " — this *en somme* is the Apostle's definition of a Christian. Let us therefore determine more in detail the significance and the soteriological aspect of the Resurrection [1].

Art. II. — THE RESURRECTION.

The Resurrection may be considered from three different points of view : 1) apologetically, i. e., regarded as a historical fact establishing Christ's Divinity, it is the foundation of our faith and the pledge of our own future resurrection (I Cor. XV, 13, 14) ; 2) Christologically, the Resurrection is the entrance of Christ into the state of glory which He had earned for Himself by His passion and death (Phil. II, 9 ; Heb. II, 9) ; 3) soteriologically, the Resurrection is an essential complement of the Redemption, for by His Death Christ liberated us from our sins, while by His Resurrection He restored to us, by the infusion of a new life, the principal blessings which we had forfeited by sin (Rom. IV, 25). These different aspects do not, as will be shown below, exclude but rather imply and supplement one another.

I. The Resurrection, in the first place, is the bulwark of our faith. When Christ by His expiating death had procured justification for us, God made Him triumph over death. His Resurrection thus becomes for the faithful the basis of their

1. Cf. Duferray, *Le Christ dans la vie chrétienne d'après saint Paul*[2] pp. 4, 5, 214 ff., 290 ff., Milligan, *The Resurrection of Our Lord*[2], pp. 18, 127, 146, 153-159.

faith in Him and a most certain token of His divine mission. For if God raised Him up this is because He is the divinely-sent Messias; His Death, though " unto the Jews indeed a stumbling-block, and unto the Gentiles foolishness " (I Cor. I, 23), was not opposed to this divine Messiasship. On the contrary, if Christ were not risen, the faith of the Christians would be vain and without object, vain also would be the preaching of the Apostles, nay, they would even be false witnesses : " if Christ be not risen again, then is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain. Yea, and we are found false witnesses of God, because we have given testimony against God, that he hath raised up Christ, whom he hath not raised up if the dead rise not again " (I Cor. XV, 14, 15). The Apostle however had adduced abundant testimony to show that Christ was risen, for " he was seen by Cephas, and after that by the eleven. Then was he seen by more than five hundred brethren at once, of whom many remain until this present, and some are fallen asleep. After that, he was seen by James, then by all the apostles. And last of all, he was seen also by me, as by one born out of due time " (I Cor. XV, 5-8).

The Resurrection thus becomes the Father's seal on Christ's completed work and a public declaration of its acceptance. For if Christ had remained a prey to death, where would have been the full knowledge ,certainty and assurance, that complete Atonement had been made, that the Father had accepted Christ's redeeming work in behalf of our sinful race, and that the foundation of perfect reconciliation between God and man had been laid ? The ground of the acceptance was indeed the Saviour's obedience even unto the death of the Cross, but it was the Resurrection which gave the joyful confidence that the work of the Redeemer had accomplished its result. Saint Paul thus connects the assurance of justification, of forgiveness, and of freedom from all condemnation, with faith in the Resurrection : " if Christ be not risen again, your faith is vain, for you are yet in your sins. Then they also that are fallen asleep in Christ are perished " (I Cor. XV, 17, 18) ; " If thou confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and believe in thy heart that God hath raised him up from the dead, thou shalt be saved " (Rom. X, 9) ; " To us it shall be reputed unto justice if we believe in him that raised up Jesus Christ, our Lord, from the dead " (Rom. IV, 24).

Our Lord's Resurrection is furthermore the type and model, the exemplary cause of our own future resurrection. This is the point of view from which the Resurrection is treated in that great paean of resurrection-hope in I Cor. xv, 12-21 : " Now if Christ be preached that he arose again from the dead, how do some among you say that there is no resurrection of the dead. But if there be no resurrection of the dead, then Christ is not risen again. .....If in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable. But now Christ is risen from the dead, the first-fruits of them that sleep. For by a man came death and by a man the resurrection of the dead, and as in Adam all die, so also in Christ all shall be made alive ". From this passage it is clear that the Apostle's teaching concerning our future resurrection is based on his doctrine of the solidarity of the human race with Christ,its Head. In His Resurrection as in His Death Christ is for Saint Paul the Representative and chief of humanity, the Second Adam containing in Himself His whole community. Christ's triumph over sin and death is not a purely individual and personal triumph of which the Son of God had no need, but it is a collective victory, it is that of the whole body of the Church of which Christ is the Head. Our incorporation into Christ is, according to the Apostle, so intimate that the members must necessarily follow the Head : " if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them who have slept through Jesus will God bring with him " (I Thess. iv, 13).

Christ's Resurrection then is the ground of the resurrection of believers : " If Christ be not risen again then they also who are fallen asleep in Christ are perished " (I Cor. xv, 17, 18). So completely does Saint Paul bind up survival after death with the hope of resurrection that in the denial of the latter he apparently feels the ground to be taken away from the former as well. Immortality of the Christian is for the Apostle incorruption (I Cor. xv, 48, 52-54 ; II Tim. i, 10), it is victory over death in body and in soul. This triumph over death is assured to us by Christ's Resurrection, " now Christ is risen from the dead, the first-fruits of them that sleep " (I Cor. xv, 20), and will be completely realized at the parousia, " the enemy death shall be destroyed last " (I Cor. xv, 26). This fact again sheds a clear light on the nature of the Christian's hope of immortality. This is no mere futurity of existence, no mere

ghostly persistence after death. The disembodied state is never presented in Scripture as other than one of incomplete being. Hence it follows that salvation from a state of sin which has brought man under the law of death must include deliverance from this incomplete condition, i. e., it must involve " the redemption of our body " (Rom. VIII, 23). For the immortality of the Christian is one of positive life, of blessedness, of glory, and of perfected likeness to Christ in body and in soul (Phil. III, 20-21).

II. Christologically, the Resurrection is, as we noted above, the entrance of Christ into a state of glory, the *point de départ* of His Exaltation and spiritual Lordship. It was a change of state — from the temporal to the eternal, from a condition which had to do with sin and the taking away of sin to one which is apart from sin : " The risen Christ dieth now no more, death shall no more have dominion over him. For in that he died to sin, he died once, but in that he liveth, he liveth unto God " (Rom. VI, 9, 10). His Death, besides being an expiation of sin, was also an act of submission and of obedience to God ; in fact the Incarnation itself already constituted an impoverishment, a humiliation, a renunciation of His divine prerogatives (II Cor. VIII, 9 ; Phil. II, 7, 8). In return for this obedience God raised Him up, exalted Him, and gave Him " a name which is above all names, that in the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of those that are in heaven, on earth, and under the earth, and that every tongue should confess that the Lord Jesus Christ is in the glory of God the Father " (Phil. II, 9-11). As the Lord of glory He is now in heaven on the right hand of God, established above all principality and power, and constituted Chief and Head of the Church (cf. I Cor. XV, 24 ; Eph. I, 20-23 ; Col. I, 18, III, 1 ; I Thess. I, 10, IV, 16 ; II Thess. I, 7). Finally as a consequence of His Resurrection Christ is the υἱὸς θεοῦ ἐν δυνάμει (Rom. I, 4), and ὁ ἔσχατος Ἀδὰμ εἰς πνεῦμα ζωοποιοῦν (I Cor. XV, 45).

III. By His initial and constant humiliation and renunciation Christ merited His glorification, exaltation, and spiritual royalty. Now this Lordship of Christ is especially the power of saving and justifying, of giving to His community the Spirit, the principle of spiritual quickening. No doubt it was in virtue of the Incarnation that Christ radically had the power of

communicating grace to us, and He exercised this power even before the Resurrection. But this power was limited by His earthly life and by the initial renouncement of the *rejaillissement* of the effects of the Incarnation. This power attained its full exercise only consequently upon His merit and His glorification. It is the glorious Christ who justifies us and who makes share of His plenitude those who become members of His mystic body.

Soteriologically, then, the Resurrection is an essential complement of the redeeming Death. The Apostle tells us that Christ was " delivered up for our sins, and rose again for our justification ", ὃς παρεδόθη διὰ τὰ παραπτώματα ἡμῶν καὶ ἠγέρθη διὰ τὴν δικαίωσιν ἡμῶν (Rom. IV, 25). In what sense did Christ " rise again for our justification " ? According to B. Weiss [1], Moule [2], Williams [3], and Westcott [4], the phrase is said to mean that the Resurrection was necessary for our justification in the sense of being the great proof that the sacrifice of the Death was divinely accepted ; its purpose is therefore evidential, so that it is little more than a certificate or a testimonial to the validity of the Death. According to Beet [5] and Gore [6], the Resurrection was necessary in order that our faith might have in the Risen Lord an adequate object. Wetzel [7], who makes our salvation depend on the role of Christ as Mediator and Intercessor, maintains that the Resurrection was of primary importance while His Death was not of absolute necessity. Finally Sanday [8], in order to give his argument more force,

---

1. *Biblical Theology of the New Testament* (E. T.), vol. I, p. 437.
2. *The Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans*, p. 127.
3. *St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans*, pp. 121-122.
4. *St. Paul and Justification*, p. 208.
5. *A Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans*, p. 140.
6. *St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans*, vol. I, p. 172.
7. *Grundlinien der Versöhnungslehre*, p. 10 ff. It may be conceded, as this author argues, that Saint Paul in his apostolic preaching is concerned primarily with the living Christ. But the living Christ is He Who died for us, and He is never preached apart from His Death and from its reconciling power. It is the Risen Christ with the virtue of His reconciling Death in Him, Who is the burden of the Apostle's message, and nothing could be more curiously unlike the New Testament than to use the Resurrection to belittle or disparage the Death. The task of the Apostle is to preach Christ — the living Christ — but in His character as the Crucified, and to set Him forth in his message as God had set Him forth already in fact, " a propitiation through faith in His Blood ".
8. *Epistle to the Romans*[5], pp. 116-118.

claims that the Resurrection was necessary for several reasons : it was at once the most conclusive evidence for Christ's Divinity, the most decisive proof of the atoning value and efficacy of His Death, and the strongest guarantee of the Christian's future resurrection.

Many of the above explanations, in so far as they are different view points of the Resurrection, are no doubt true, but they are not an adequate interpretation of our text. Thus it is true that without the Resurrection faith would not have an adequate object (cf. Rom. IV, 24, X, 9), and that the Resurrection placed upon the Death of Christ the stamp of God's approval. But if this were the whole truth there would be no inner or essential but a purely external and temporary relation between the Resurrection and our justification. The Resurrection would be a matter which could be dispensed with as soon as faith is gained. There is a deeper and more fundamental reason why Christ " rose for our justification ". At the Resurrection Christ became a πνεῦμα ζωοποιοῦν both for Himself and for us : for Himself, because the grace of which He possessed the plenitude overflowed, as it were, on His body and rendered it spiritual, for us, because He communicates to us the gifts of the Spirit and the Holy Spirit Himself [1].

Christ then in His risen state becomes for us the principle of spiritual quickening (I Cor. XV, 45). Previous to the moment of the Resurrection Christ had indeed possessed the Spirit in its plenitude but was not as yet capable of communicating this fulness of life to others because of the limitations inherent in the economy of Redemption. This privilege had as a preliminary condition the Death and the Resurrection, so that it is only in His glorified state that Christ becomes a life-giving spirit. As πνεῦμα ζωοποιοῦν the Lord is the Depositor and Distributor *par excellence* of the Holy Spirit (cf. John XIV, 18, XVI, 7).

The Apostle frequently attributes the same operations at once

1. PRAT, o. c., vol. II[6], p. 252, notes that without the Resurrection baptism would not have its complete symbolism. In baptism we die and rise with Christ : we die mystically with Him in so far as we are associated to His Death, and we rise in so far as we are sacramentally united to His Resurrection. But if the Resurrection be suppressed, baptism and even faith itself, which does not justify without some relation to baptism, lose their significance and efficacy.

to both the Lord and the Spirit, and juxtaposes as parallel the expressions εἶναι ἐν Χριστῷ and εἶναι ἐν πνεύματι, Χριστὸς ἐν ὑμῖν and τὸ πνεῦμα ἐν ὑμῖν. Some Protestant theologians as Holtzmann [1], Gunkel [2], and Deissmann [3], maintain, on the basis of II Cor. III, 17 : ὁ δὲ κύριος τὸ πνεῦμα ἐστι [4], that in the Pauline Epistles *The Lord = The Spirit.* This interpretation is often put forward as the chief proof and illustration of the Hellenistic character of the Apostle's thinking. He has ceased, we are told, to regard Christ as a historical person, nay, has almost ceased to look on Him as a Personality at all. Christ in this view is little else than a name for the pervasive divine principle which works for the world's redemption. But this opinion is wholly untenable. Never in Saint Paul is the preexistent Christ, the historical Christ, or Christ the Redeemer, identified with the Spirit. In Rom. VIII, 11 the Apostle speaks of " the *Spirit* of him that raised up *Jesus* ", thus plainly differentiating Jesus as an individual from the Spirit. The points of contact between Christ and the Spirit concern solely the Risen Christ in His mystic life within the Church ; but even there a distinction is apparent, as will become evident from the following texts :

---

1. *Lehrbuch der neutestamentlichen Theologie*[2], p. 90.
2. *Die Wirkungen des heiligen Geistes*[3], p. 90.
3. *St. Paul, a Study in Social and Religious History* (E. T.), p. 127.
4. In the text of II Cor. III, 17, ὁ κύριος τὸ πνεῦμα ἐστιν, it is more probable that ὁ κύριος and not τὸ πνεῦμα is the subject of the phrase; in order that the inversion be admissible, it would be necessary that κύριος, in order to serve as a predicate, be without the definite article. Secondly, ὁ κύριος denotes Christ; this acceptation of ὁ κύριος recommends itself for a twofold reason: apart from OT quotations, Saint Paul always understands κύριος, whether with or without the article, of the Son of God and never of God Himself ; this sense is likewise required by the verses which immediately precede and follow v. 17, and in which Lord = Christ. Thirdly, τὸ πνεῦμα is not the Person of the Holy Spirit, for even if we suppose, on the one hand, that ὁ κύριος denotes God the Father we would obtain a reading which is evidently false, and if, on the other hand, we suppose that ὁ κύριος denotes the divine nature without distinction of Persons, we obtain a reading which can be justified by no exegetical subtlety; and if, as we have said above ὁ κύριος denotes Christ, the equation, the Son = the Spirit, is repugnant not only to the general Pauline doctrine but also to the very notion of Person. Τὸ πνεῦμα, we think, denotes the spirit as opposed to the letter. The Apostle, after having told his Corinthian converts that they themselves are his letter of recommendation, written not with ink but with " the Spirit of the living God " (III, 3), makes the antithesis, " letter and spirit ", the main point of his apology. His ministry, he says, is not that of the *old dispensation* but of the *new* (III, 6), not of the *letter* but of the *spirit* (III, 6, 8), not of *death* but of *life* (III, 7), not of *condemnation* but of *justice* (III, 9).

" The grace of our *Lord Jesus Christ*,
and the charity of *God (the Father)*
and the communication of the *Holy Ghost* be with you all "
(II Cor. XIII, 13).

" There are diversities of *graces*, but the same *Spirit*,
and there are diversities of *ministries*, but the same *Lord*,
and there are diversities of *operations*, but the same *God*,
who worketh all in all " (I Cor. XII, 4-6).

" *God* saved us by the laver of regeneration and renovation
of the *Holy Ghost*, whom he hath poured forth upon us
[abundantly,
through *Jesus Christ* our Saviour " (Tit. III, 4-6).

" He that confirmeth us with you in *Christ*
is *God*, who also hath sealed us,
and given the pledge of the *Spirit* in our hearts " (II Cor. I,
[21-22).

" I, the minister of *Christ Jesus* among the Gentiles, sanctify-
[ing the
gospel of *God*, that the oblation of the Gentiles may be
acceptable and sanctified in the *Holy Ghost* " (Rom. XV, 16).

If Saint Paul attributes the same operations at once to the Risen Christ and the Holy Spirit this is because the Two, Who elsewhere are always represented as distinct Persons, seem to merge into each other in their role of sanctifying souls. There their field of action and sphere of influence compenetrate. Christ is the Head of that mystic body of which the Holy Spirit is the soul, and in the language of the Apostle almost all vital phenomena can be attributed indifferently to the head or to the soul. But while there is identity of operations there is no

---

Christ therefore is the spirit of which the Apostle speaks in these verses, i. e. the spirit opposed to the letter (cf. I Cor. XV, 45). The use of the article with πνεῦμα here is perhaps called forth by the emphatic position given to πνεῦμα. In this whole passage Saint Paul speaks of the glory of the ministry of the spirit. But this glory is first of all resplendent in Christ Himself. We are all transformed by His glory as by the Spirit of the Lord (cf. II Cor. IV, 4).

For an interpretation of II Cor. III, 17 cf. LEBRETON, *Les origines du dogme de la Trinité*[4], pp. 179, 565-569, PRAT, o. c., vol. II[6], pp. 522-529, HOLTZMEISTER, II Cor. III, 17 : *Dominus autem Spiritus est*, p. 30 ff., LEMONNYER, *Épîtres de saint Paul*, vol. I, p. 197, SWETE, *The Holy Spirit in the New Testament*[2], p. 194 ff., E. F. SCOTT, *The Spirit in the New Testament*, p. 117 ff., FERRARI, *L'uomo irredento in san Paolo*, p. 63 ff., HEADLAM, *St. Paul and Christianity*, p. 106 ff., BUCKHAM, art. *Are Christ and the Spirit Identical in Paul's Traching*, Exp., 1921, pp. 154-160.

confusion of persons. The points of contact between Christ and the Spirit concern solely the glorified Christ, not in His physical and personal life on the right hand of the Father, but in His mystic life within the bosom of the Church. In our supernatural life we live by the Son and we live by the Spirit, or, more exactly, we live by the Holy Spirit sent by the Son. By participating in Christ's Spirit the Christian ceases to be a slave of Sin and Satan, is able to overcome the concupiscences of the flesh, is regenerated and justified, walks according to and produces the fruits of the Holy Ghost (Gal. v, 16-25 ; Rom. viii, 2, 4, 9).

This role of the Resurrection as complement of the redeeming Death also helps us to explain the antinomy which Holtzmann [1], and others pretend to find in the Pauline Epistles. According to these theologians the Apostle had two theories of the Redemption, the one juridical and the other ethical. The former, they say, is derived from the Apostles' Pharisaic education, the latter from Hellenism. The former is based on merit, penal substitution, and vicarious satisfaction, the latter on interior renovation. The former deals with such ideas as expiation, propitiation, and sacrifice, the latter with religious experience. For the one reconciliation is an objective performance by Christ as Mediator between God and humanity, for the other reconciliation is effected in the individual conscience. For the one Redemption has an objective value independent of its individual application, for the other it has only a subjective value in so far as it is appropriated by faith. These two currents of thought, we are told, are opposed to one another, and run more or less parallel throughout the Pauline Epistles. However, according to the explanation which we have given above, these two conceptions are not contradictory but complementary. The atoning effects of the Redemption, which Christ juridically procured for us by His Death, are effectively appropriated by us through a participation of the Spirit of the Risen Christ.

1. O. c., pp. 123-131. The author thus concludes his study of the two currents of thought which he claims to find in the Pauline Epistles : Zum Schlusse ergibt sich aus dem Gesagten dasz die beiden Gedankstränge welche immer deutlicher als parallel neben einander herlaufend in Sicht getreten sind, zwar nicht in einander geflochten und unter dem Gesichtspunkt eines einheitlichen Gesamtverlaufs gebracht werden dürfen, wohl aber beide zugleich in Gebrauch gesetzt und stramm angezogen sein wollen, wenn der Wagen in Bewegung geraten und vom Flecke kommen soll " (p. 130).

The Apostle himself is careful to bring out the close connection between these aspects of the redeeming work : " We are justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, whom God hath proposed to be a propitiation, through faith, in his blood to the showing of his justice, that he may be just and the justifier of him who is of the faith of Jesus Christ " (Rom. III, 24-26). In this passage we find indicated at once the initiative of God, the work of Christ, and the part of man, in the process of Redemption.

Christ risen from the dead and become a " vivifying spirit, " — this is the end of the soteriological cycle through which the Second Adam, the Chief of the new humanity, passed. For His mystic body the possession of the Spirit is likewise the term of the salvific effects. Such however is the objective order. With Christ dying and risen from the dead this spiritual humanity does not exist save ideally. The mystic community is to be formed progressively by the continual addition of new members until its complete configuration as determined by divine predestination. Since it is only by union with Christ that one has part in His Redemption and shares its salutary effects, how then, we might ask, is this incorporation into Christ effectively realized ? This incorporation is realized by a communion of Christ's Life, by a participation of His Spirit. By this participation of the Spirit, Who unites Himself intimately and mysteriously to his spirit without absorbing or destroying it, man enters into the possession of all the effects of the Redemption. He is delivered from Sin, from the flesh, and from death (Rom. VIII, 2, 10, 11, 13), receives justice and justification (Gal. II, 17, III, 2, 5, 14 ; I Cor. I, 30 ; VI, 11 ; II Cor. V, 21 ; Rom. VIII, 1), becomes an adopted son (Gal. III, 26, IV, 6 ; Rom, VIII, 14), and is constituted heir of the Messianic blessings (Gal. V, 5 ; Eph. I, 13, 14 ; II Cor. I, 22). What then are the means placed by God at the disposal of man for the appropriation of Christs' Spirit and for entering into His community, in order to receive the " abundance of grace, and of the gift, and of justice through the one, Jesus Christ " (Rom. V, 17) ? These means, as we shall now see, are faith and baptism.

PART III.

Humanity after the Redemption. — The Liberty of the Spirit.

CHAPTER I.

Subjective Appropriation of the Effects of the Redemption.

Art. I. — FAITH.

PRELIMINARY.

Faith, the condition and means of appropriating subjectively the atoning effects of Christ's Redemption, plays a very important role in the Pauline Epistles [1]. By faith, says the Apostle, we have remission of sins and reconciliation with God: " If Christ be not risen again, your faith is vain, for you are yet in your sins " (I Cor. xv, 17); " God hath proposed Christ to be a propitiation through faith in his blood " (Rom. iii, 25). By faith we cease to be ἀσθενεῖς, ἐχθροί, and ἁμαρτωλοί (Rom. v, 6, 8, 10). By faith we are delivered from the *paedagogium*

1. Πίστις is derived from πείθειν which in the active voice signifies " to persuade or attempt to persuade "; in the middle, πείθεσθαι, " to let oneself be persuaded or convinced "; in the second perfect, πεποιθέναι, " to be convinced, to have confidence "; πεποιθῶς and πεποίθησις which come from πεποιθέναι follow its sense (cf. II Cor. i, 15, iii, 4, x, 2; II Cor. viii, 22; Phil. iii, 4). The verb πείθω often has the sense of persuading, believing, having confidence, in texts which are not specifically of religious import: Ἄρτι γὰρ ἀνθρώπους πείθω ἢ τὸν θεόν (Gal. i, 10; cf. II Cor. v, 11); πέπεισμαι δὲ ὅτι καὶ ἐν σοί (II Tim. i, 5; cf. II Tim. i, 12; Rom. viii, 38, xiv, 14, xv, 14): ἐγὼ πέποιθα εἰς ὑμᾶς ἐν κυρίῳ ὅτι οὐδὲν ἄλλο φρονήσετε (Gal. v, 10; cf. II Thess. iii, 4; II Cor. ii, 3, x, 7; Rom. ii, 19; Phil. i, 6, 14, 25, ii, 24; Philem. 21). The derivate, πιστεύειν, has the general sense of " to believe, to admit " (cf. I Cor. xi, 18, xiii, 7). Saint Paul also speaks of the Gospel which had been " committed " to him; cf. I Thess. ii, 4; Gal. ii, 7; I Cor. ix, 17 (πιστευθῆναι, πεπίστευμαι; cf. Rom. iii, 2: ὅτι ἐπιστεύθησαν τὰ λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ). Cf. Lemonnyer, *Épîtres de saint Paul*, vol. I, p. 254 ff.

Πίστις is also used in the special sense of a) *fidelity of God:* μὴ ἡ ἀπιστία

and from the malediction of the Law (Gal. III, 25, 13, 14), become sons of Abraham (Gal. III, 7), have part in the blessings promised to him (Gal. III, 9 ; Rom. IV, 16), possess peace, and confident access to God (Rom. V, 1 ; Eph. III, 12). By faith we live in Christ and Christ in us (Gal. II, 20, III, 26 ; Eph. III, 17), become a " new creation, " and receive the Spirit, the token of the Messianic inheritance.

The Apostle constantly associates faith with justice and justification. " The justice of God is by the faith of Jesus Christ " (Rom. III, 22), justice results or comes from faith (Rom. IX, 30), is based on faith (Phil. III, 9), in a word, is the justice of faith (Rom. IV, 11-13). It is in favor of the believer that the justice of God manifests itself in the Gospel (Rom. I, 17, III, 21), it is faith which is reckoned unto justice (Gal. III, 6 ; Rom. IV, 3-5, 9-12, 22-25), and it is justice which comes from faith that Saint Paul and the Christians pursue and not that which comes from the Law (Rom. IX, 30-33 ; X, 1-10 ; Phil. III, 9-10). Being the means of arriving at justice, it is also, by that very fact, the means of obtaining justification: man is not justified ἐξ ἔργων νόμου but only διὰ πίστεως Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ, ἐκ πίστεως Χριστοῦ, πίστει, and ἐν Χριστῷ (Gal. II, 16, 17 ; III, 8, 24 ; Rom. III, 28). God justifies the circumcision ἐκ πίστεως and the uncircumcision διὰ τῆς πίστεως (Rom. III, 30 ; V, 1). Verily, according to Saint Paul, faith is the *initium, radix, et fundamentum omnis justificationis.* In view of this great and fundamental importance which the Apostle constantly attributes to faith, let us consider more in detail its nature, its object and origin, as well as its efficacy [1].

αὐτῶν τὴν πίστιν τοῦ θεοῦ καταργήσει (Rom. III, 3) ; b) *fidelity of servants:* πᾶσαν πίστιν ἐνδεικνυμένους ἀγαθὴν (Tit. II, 10), *and of widows:* τὴν πρώτην πίστιν ἠθέτησαν (I Tim. V, 12) ; c) *good faith:* πᾶν δὲ ὃ οὐκ ἐκ πίστεως ἁμαρτία ἐστιν; d) *faith of miracles* (cf. Rom. XII, 3-6 ; I Cor. XII, 9, XIII, 2). It is however only with πιστεύω and πίστις in the strictly religious sense that we shall be concerned in our study. Faith, according to its particular context, may denote an act, a habit, or an object. Faith is a) *actual,* when it is related to justification which it produces (cf. Rom. III, 22, 28, 30 IV 5, 9, 11, 13, 16, V, 1 ; Gal. II, 16, III, 8, 9, 11 ; Phil. III, 9) ; b) *habitual,* when it is accompanied by a personal pronoun or a genitive (Rom. I, 8, 12 ; I Thess. I, 3, 8, III, 2, 5, 6, 7 ; cf. also Gal. V, 22 ; II Thess. I, 4 ; I Tim. I, 14 ; II Cor. X, 15 ; Gal. II, 20 ; II Cor. V, 7 ; I Cor. XVI, 13) ; c) *objective,* when it stands for the Gospel or the Christian economy (cf. Rom. III, 31, IV, 14 ; Gal. I, 23 ; Rom. X, 8, I, 5, XVI, 26 ; Gal. III, 2, III, 23-25).

1. PRAT, o. c., vol. II[6], pp. 281-282, tells us that in the analysis of faith three mistakes are to be avoided : 1) to explain the biblical usage by the

I. THE NATURE OF FAITH.

The dominating and principal element of Christian faith as described by Saint Paul, one which is at the basis of every act of faith, is intellectual belief. This is especially true when the object of faith is a past or future act, or when the truth is not directly related to salvation. Such was the faith of Abraham who, though the object of his faith was in the future, believed firmly without being affected by incredulity or shaken by doubt. This intellectual conviction brings about an obedience of the whole man to the divine will as known by revelation, so that he receives the Gospel fact as an irrefragable proof of God's love for men. Finally, if faith is in Him Who promises, it is also confident and hopeful. [1]

While obedience and confidence are only accidental effects of faith, it is strange to find that in modern theology, which is not yet emancipated from Lutheran orthodoxy, " trust " still continues to retain its primary place. We need cite only a few quotations from contemporary Protestant authors to become convinced of this fact. Thus according to Morgan [2] faith is " trust in the sin-forgiving, salvation-bringing grace of God revealed to men in Jesus Christ. To believe is to rely on the gracious purpose of which He is mediator. " So also according

---

profane usage, since the two have nothing in common save the name; 2) to take as *point de départ* the etymology of the Greek word, a product of a different race and civilisation ; 3) to proceed from the notion of *faith* to the notion of believing, since in the Hebrew where the concept of Christian faith was first elaborated the grammatical derivation proceeds from the verb to the substantive.

1. BENZ, *Die Ethik des Apostels Paulus*, BS, 1912, p. 47, thus sums up the Pauline concept of faith : " Fassen wir die Momente zusammen, so dürfen wir den Glauben als die höchste, den ganzen Menschen nach Verstand und Willen in Anspruck nehmende sittliche Tat bezeichnen, welche den Menschen zum gelehrigen Schüler und gehorsamen Diener der göttlichen Offenbarung macht. Enthüllt Gott Geheimnisse, so hält sie der Mensch für wahr. Gibt Gott eine Verheissung so hofft er ; bietet er ein Gut an, so vertraut er ; tut er seinen Willen kund, so gehorcht er. Alle diese psychologischen Momente : Glauben (=Fürwahrhalten), Hoffnung, Vertrauen, Gehorsam, und dazu die Liebe umfaszt der paulinische πίστις — Begriff ". Cf. LATTEY, art. *De justificatione per fidem*, VDni, March 1924, pp. 80-86, HARENT, art. *Foi*, DTC, vol. VI, pp. 58-78, MERK, art. *Justus ex fide vivit*, VDni, 1923, pp. 193-198, 231-237, 257-264, TOBAC, o. c., p. 225 ff., BARTMANN, *S. Paulus und S. Jacobus über die Rechtfertigung*, BS, 1897, p. 40 ff., MONSE, *Johannes und Paulus*, NTA, 1915, p. 121 ff.

2. *The Religion and Theology of Paul*, p. 117.

to Peake [1] faith is an " act of personal trust and self-surrender, the movement of man's whole soul in confidence towards Christ". Denney [2] tells us that " if a man with the sense of his sin on him sees what Christ on His Cross means, there is only one thing for him to do — one thing which is inevitably demanded in that moral situation : to abandon himself to the sin-bearing love which appeals to Him in Christ, and to do so unreservedly, unconditionally and forever. This is what the New Testament means by faith. " Similarly, according to Garvie [3] faith means " trust in God's grace as revealed in Christ, an acceptance of the forgiveness of sin that has come to man in His Cross. " For Chadwick [4] faith is not the " acceptance of even the most precious dogma concerning God or the soul of man. It is the reliance of man upon his living Lord and Friend. " We need not multiply quotations any further. Should one ask how, after the intellectual element has been eliminated, faith still retains its certitude, the above definitions become still more unsatisfactory and obscure. Let us rather turn now to Saint Paul's Epistles, and see how important a role the intellectual element plays in his conception of faith [5].

In Rom. c. IV the Apostle describes in glowing terms the faith of Abraham which on the one hand was reckoned to him unto justice independently of works, and on the other was a prototype of the Christians' faith (Gal. III, 5). Though, humanly speaking, the promise of a numerous progeny was a forlorn

1. *The Quintessence of Paulinism*, p. 30.

2. *The Christian Doctrine of Reconciliation*, pp. 289-290. Cf. also by the same author, art. *Faith and the Righteousness of God*, Exp., 1901, pp. 81-95.

3. *Studies of Paul and His Gospel*, p. 267.

4. Art. *The Just Shall Live by Faith*, Exp., 1906, p. 182.

Directly opposed to the above is the view of RASHDALL, *The Idea of Atonement*, pp. 108-109 . " I think it cannot be denied that Saint Paul does habitually identify faith with intellectual belief. This is shown by the illustrations which he gives to prove that even before Christ's coming faith had been the root-principle of goodness in the holy men of old. Abraham's faith consisted in believing God — believing the various divine communications made to him, in particular believing that he should beget a child when he was a hundred years old. .....We should not perhaps be going very far from St. Paul s real meaning if we said that the belief to which St. Paul attributes the justifying effect was belief in the whole revelation of God through Christ, in God's whole scheme of supplying out of His special grace or favor a means of justification to those who had failed to obtain it as of right through the law of Moses or the law of their own conscience ".

5. Cf. BIARD, *Les vertus théologales d'après les épîtres de saint Paul*, pp. 13, 17 ff.

hope, Abraham did not waver in his faith but was firmly persuaded that God would accomplish what He promised. "Who against hope believed in hope, that he might be made the father of many nations, according to that which was said to him: So shall thy seed be. And he was not weak in faith, neither did he consider his own body now dead, whereas he was almost an hundred years old, nor the dead womb of Sara. In the promise also of God he staggered not by distrust (οὐ διεκρίθη τῇ ἀπιστίᾳ), but was strengthened in faith giving glory to God, most fully knowing that whatsoever he has promised he is also able to perform" (Rom. IV, 18-21). Here the Apostle describes the faith, the belief, the intellectual assent to divine revelation under the influence of a will well-disposed. This will impedes the intelligence from stopping at difficulties which arise against revelation, or from ceding to doubt and incredulity, οὐ διεκρίθη τῇ ἀπιστίᾳ. By believing God on His word, by placing with a full conviction the divine omnipotence above the apparent impossibilities of the miracle announced, Abraham rendered glory to God. The faith therefore which Saint Paul praises in Abraham is not that of the Protestants whereby one "trusts" that his sins were remitted in Christ, but the general and Catholic faith by which Abraham believed all that God told him. In fact, the Apostle concludes: "Now it is not written only for him, that it was reputed to him unto justice, but also for us, to whom it shall be reputed, if we believe in him that raised up Jesus Christ, our Lord, from the dead" (Rom. IV, 23, 24). To "believe" then, is to accept the Gospel, persevere in it, and retain it firmly: "The Gospel in the power of God unto salvation to everyone that believeth, to the Jew first, and to the Greek. For the justice of God is revealed therein, from faith unto faith, as it is written: the just man liveth by faith" (Rom. I, 16, 17) Elsewhere faith is identified with belief in Jesus Christ: "The justice of God, by faith of Jesus Christ, unto all and upon all them that believe in him" (Rom. III, 22; cf. VI, 8).

In Rom. X, 9 Saint Paul describes the new way of obtaining justification and salvation, and says that this consists in professing and believing the two fundamental articles of Christianity, namely, the Divinity and Resurrection of Christ: "if thou confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and believe in thy heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt

be saved " (ὅτι ἐὰν ὁμολογήσῃς ἐν τῷ στόματι σου κύριον Ἰησοῦν, καὶ πιστεύσῃς ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σοῦ ὅτι ὁ θεὸς αὐτὸν ἤγειρεν ἐκ νεκρῶν σωθήσῃ) (Cf. Rom. IV, 24). In order to have part in the salvation of Christ one must therefore make public confession that " Jesus is the Lord " and believe in His Resurrection. Here again the intellectual character of faith is evident. Nor can any objection be urged against our interpretation from the words, ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ. There is nothing to prove that καρδία denotes the affective part of man. The expression is an Hebraism in virtue of which καρδία denotes the interior as opposed to the exterior man ; one must believe internally and not merely with his lips. Moreover, in the LXX, on which Saint Paul depends, the term καρδία denotes the seat of intelligence, the judgment.

Faith, in so far as it is *ex auditu*, is likewise represented by the Apostle as an adhesion of the mind to divine testimony : " But all do not obey the Gospel. For Isaias saith : Lord, who hath believed our report ? Faith then cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of Christ " (Rom. X, 16, 17). Similarly to the Galatians Saint Paul writes : " This only would I learn of you : did you receive the Spirit by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith " (Gal. III, 2 ; cf. I Thess. II, 13) ? From these texts it is clear that faith is not some sort of a mystical tendency towards an object more suspected than known, but that it is intellectual belief. It is again in the sense of intellectual persuasion that the term *faith* is used in Rom. XIV, 23 : " All that is not of faith is sin. " Πίστις here is the conviction which we have of the liceity of our actions.

In I Cor. I, 21 ; III, 5 ; XIV, 22 ; and XV, 2 ; ἐπιστεύσατε is used as an equivalent of τὸ εὐαγγέλιον... ὃ καὶ παρελάβετε, ἐν ᾧ καὶ ἑστήκατε. To " believe " is to persevere firmly in the Gospel : " My preaching was not in the persuasive words of human wisdom, but in showing of the Spirit and power, that your faith might not stand on the wisdom of me, but on the power of God " (I Cor. II, 5) ; " if Christ be not risen again, then is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain " (I Cor. XV, 14 ; cf. XV, 11) ; " Watch ye, stand fast in the faith, do manfully, and be strengthened " (I Cor. XVI, 13).

In his second letter to the Corinthians the Apostle characterizes the future life as a special presence of the Lord for us : " But we are confident, and have a good will to be absent

rather from the body, and to be present with the Lord" (II Cor. v, 8). The principle of this presence will be εἶδος. Our existence here below, on the other hand, is characterized by an absence from the Lord; the reason of this estrangement is the fact that we are under a regime of πίστις: διὰ πίστεως γὰρ περιπατοῦμεν οὐ διὰ εἴδους (v, 7). While εἶδος therefore signifies a perfect knowledge of the Lord which will render Him present to us, the opposite term, πίστις, denotes an imperfect knowledge, which leaves its object as it were distant, but which is nevertheless knowledge, belief (cf. I Cor. XIII, 12-13).

In his Epistle to the Thessalonians the Apostle tells his converts that their faith in God (ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν ἡ πρὸς τὸν θεὸν) is known to all, and thus explains his affirmation: "For they themselves relate of us, what manner of entering in we had unto you, and how you turned to God from idols to serve the living and true God" (I Thess. I, 9). Their "faith in God" (v, 8) accordingly denotes conversion from polytheism to the belief in a true God (cf. I Thess. II, 10-13, 14, IV, 14). Elsewhere the Apostle describes salutary faith as an adhesion to the truth: "Gos has chosen you to save you by the sanctification of the Spirit and by faith in truth" (πίστις ἀληθείας; ; cf. Col. II, 12: πίστις τῆς ἐνεργείας τοῦ θεοῦ; Phil. I, 27: πίστις τοῦ εὐαγγελίου) (II Thess. II, 13). But if faith has truth for its object, is it not an act of simple belief? Moreover, is not truth an object to which "trust" cannot be directed? While we do admit that confidence of pardon and other religious sentiments ought ulteriorly be added, we do deny that these are designated by the term, "faith."

The Epistles of the Captivity likewise supply sufficient evidence for an intellectual faith. "As therefore you have received Jesus Christ the Lord," says the Apostle, "walk ye in him, rooted and built up in him, and confirmed in the faith, as also you have learned, abounding in him in thanksgiving" (Col. II, 6, 7). Saint Paul immediately explains this faith by pointing out the enemies who menace it, and by characterizing it as a solid conviction which resists the teaching of false philosophy: "Beware lest any man cheat you by philosophy and vain deceit, according to the tradition of men, according to the elements of the world, and not according to Christ" (II, 8; cf. also II, 12).

In Eph. IV, 13 the Apostle associates as closely related the

ideas, " the unity of faith " and " the knowledge of the Son of God. " In Phil. III, 8, 9 he uses as synonyms the expressions " knowledge of Christ " and " faith in Christ " : " I count all things to be but loss for the excellent knowledge of Jesus Christ my Lord, for whom I have suffered the loss of all things, and count them but as dung, that I may gain Christ, and may be found in him, not having my justice, which is of the law, but that which is of the faith of Christ Jesus, which is of God justice in faith. "

It is again faith as intellectual adhesion to the true doctrine which the Apostle in the Pastorals opposes to the false teaching of the heretics (I Tim. I, 19 ; IV, 1 ; II Tim. II, 17, 18 ; Tit. I, 13, 14). Finally, the intellectual character of faith is evident from the fact that Saint Paul contrasts it with ignorance (I Tim. I, 13) and incredulity (Rom. IV, 20). While in all these texts πίστις is used in the subjective sense, there are also several passages in which it is used objectively (Gal. I, 23, III, 23, VI, 10 ; I Tim. IV, 6). This second usage likewise supports our thesis since πίστις would never come to mean doctrine if the act of believing was not an adhesion of the mind to a doctrine.

This intellectual conviction, restricted at first to the sphere of the understanding, immediately produces an impression on the soul which receives the Gospel as an irrefragable proof of the divine love for men. This impression brings about a submission of man's whole being to the divine Will as known by revelation. Active and normal faith necessarily involves this act of obedience since it contains implicitly the wish to do all the things that God will ordain ; it is faith of which charity is the form (Gal. V, 6), it is faith which justifies. In fact, " to believe " and " to obey " are frequently synonyms in the Pauline Epistles. The Apostle frequently speaks of the " obedience of faith [1], " and describes incredulity as a lack of submission, as a revolt. The crime of the Jews was that they did not submit to the faith (οὐχ ὑπετάγησαν, Rom. X, 3, 16 ; cf. Rom. VI, 17, XV, 18). Again, in the Apostle's statement to the Thes-

1. Cf. Rom. I, 5 : δι' οὗ ἐλάβομεν χάριν καὶ ἀποστολὴν εἰς ὑπακοὴν πίστεως ἐν πᾶσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ὑπὲρ τοῦ ὀνόματος αὐτοῦ ; Rom. XVI, 25, 26 : μυστηρίου... φανερωθέντος δὲ νῦν διά τε γραφῶν προφητικῶν... εἰς ὑπακοὴν πίστεως εἰς πάντα τά ἔθνη γνωρισθέντος. In these passages the expression, εἰς ὑπακοὴν πίστεως = in view of the obedience of the faith (obj. gen.). Cf. Rom. X, 16 : ὑπήκουσαν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ, II Cor. X, 5 : εἰς τὴν ὑπακοὴν τοῦ Χριστοῦ, Acts XI, 7 : ὑπήκουον τῇ πίστει.

salonians, " we were comforted, brethren, in you, in all our necessity and tribulation, by your faith, because now we live, if you stand is the Lord " (I Thess. III, 7, 8 : διὰ τοῦτο παρεκλήθημεν, ἀδελφοί, ἐφ' ὑμῖν ἐπὶ πάσῃ τῇ ἀνάγκῃ καὶ θλίψει ἡμῶν διὰ τῆς ὑμῶν πίστεως, ὅτι νῦν ζῶμεν ἐὰν ὑμεῖς στήκετε ἐν κυρίῳ), the expression διὰ τῆς ὑμῶν πίστεως is equivalent to ὑμεῖς στήκετε ἐν κυρίῳ. It is therefore because man is convinced that God has manifested His grace and pardon in Christ and justifies those who are united to Christ, that he submits to the Gospel and wishes to participate in the atoning effects of the Redemption through the reception of baptism.

When the object of faith by its nature falls within the domain of hope, sincere faith also produces confidence. But this happens only accidentally when the revelation which one believes contains a promise, and can thus excite hope of the thing promised or confidence in Him who promises. Many revelations, however, have a different content, threaten punishment, lay down precepts, or promise nothing. Again, frequently, faith has an object to which " trust " cannot be directed [1]. Faith, moreover, possesses an intrinsic moral value even apart from obedience and confidence [2].

Many modern theologians, though they concede that Saint Paul frequently uses the term *faith* to denote simple belief in

1. Cf. II Thess. II, 12 : " God hath chosen you first-fruits unto salvation-in sanctification of the spirit and faith of the truth " (πίστει ἀληθείας) ; Col. II, 12 : " In whom (Christ) also you are risen again by the faith of the operation of God (διὰ τῆς πίστεως τῆς ἐνεργείας τοῦ θεοῦ), who hath raised him up from the dead " ; Rom. X, 16 : " But all do not obey the gospel. For Isaias saith : Lord, who hath believed our report " (τίς ἐπίστευσεν τῇ ἀκοῇ ἡμῶν) ? Cf. I Cor. XV, 2, etc.

2. Faith cannot exist in its most simple stage without the *pius credulitatis affectus*, whereby man freely acknowledges God's authority and implicitly confesses the veracity of His testimony. " Without faith it is impossible to please God. For he that cometh to God, must believe that he is, and is a rewarder to them that seek him " (Heb. XI, 6 ; cf. XI, 5), — here we have a faith in which the will plays the least part, yet the Apostle says that by it it is possible to please God. The same is true of the faith described by Habakkuk (cf. Rom. I, 17; Gal. III, 11), which was a firm adhesion to the divine word, a firm belief that the prophecy made in God's name would be accomplished ; and the fruit of this faith would be the fact that by it the just will live, i. e., be the object of providential preservation. So too Abraham, the object of whose faith was not only in the distant future but also, humanly speaking, inconceivable, believed without hesitation or doubt ; by the firmness of his assent and by his implicit acknowledgment of the Divine veracity he gave glory to God Who in turn imputed his faith unto justice (Rom. IV, 16-22).

the word of God, maintain that faith has another and more profound meaning in the New Testament. This meaning, they say, presupposes belief but adds to it a subsequent affective element which is variously described by different authors, but in which the essence of faith is said to be contained. Thus Warfield [1] writes that " faith obviously contains in it an element of knowledge, and it as obviously issues in conduct. But it consists neither in assent nor in obedience, but in a reliant trust in the invisible author of all good, in which the mind is set upon the things that are above and not on the things that are upon the earth.... So little is faith in its biblical conception merely a conviction of the understanding, that, when that is called faith, the true idea of faith needs to be built up above this word. It is the movement of the whole inner man... the going out of the heart from itself and its resting on God in confident trust for all good. For sinful man this hearty reliance on God necessarily becomes humble trust in Him for the fundamental need of the sinner — forgiveness of sins and reception into favor. " So too Morgan [2] writes : " Luther restored faith to the place which it occupies in the theology of Paul.... The new significance attached to faith implies a deepened conception of it. It is no longer conceived as primarily an affair of the intellect... It is nothing else than personal trust in the sin-forgiving grace of God. "

What is to be said of this view ? In the first place, we do not deny that there is in Christian faith a sort of confidence or " trust " in God. When one believes another because of his veracity or competence he in a way confides in him. But this reliance which we recognize as essential to Christian faith is not posterior but *anterior* to belief. Confiding in the knowledge and veracity of God, we believe on His word that He wishes to pardon us because of Christ ; for Catholics this belief is faith, for Protestants it is only a preliminary. Secondly, as a consequence of this belief there arises in us not only reliant trust but also other religious sentiments such as humility, penance, abandonment to God, and the beginning of love ; for Protestants this confidence of pardon is an act of faith properly so-called, for Catholics it is merely a result of faith.

1. Art. *Faith*, HDB, vol. I, p. 836.
2. Art. *Faith* (Christian), ERE, vol. V, p. 691.

Protestant theologians frequently adduce in favor of their interpretation a category of texts where the verb πιστεύω is employed without any complement[1], or where it is employed with a preposition and an accusative. In regard to the latter usage Warfield[2] remarks: " When we advance to the constructions with prepositions, we enter a region in which the deeper sense of the word — that of firm, trustful reliance — comes to its full rights.... Constructions with prepositions governing the accusative, involve an implication of ' moral motion, of mental direction towards '... The special N. T. construction, however, is that of εἰς, which occurs some forty-nine times, about four-fifths of which are Johannine and the remainder more or less Pauline. The object towards which faith is thus said to be reliantly directed... is always a person, and that very rarely God... most commonly Christ... a glance over these passages will bring clearly out the pregnancy of the meaning conveyed. It may be more of a question wherein the pregnancy resides. It is probably sufficient to find it in the sense conveyed by the verb itself, while the proposition adjoins only the person towards whom the strong feeling expressed by the verb is directed. In any event, what these passages express is an ' absolute transference of trust from ourselves to another, ' a complete self-surrender to Christ. "

The first case, i. e., where πιστεύω is employed without a complement, need not detain us here very long. These texts

---

1. Texts of this category in the Gospels have usually their complement indicated in the context, and can hardly be adduced in favor of the Protestant interpretation. Thus in Lk. I, 45, we read : " blessed art thou who hast *believed,* because *those things* shall be accomplished *that were spoken* to thee by the Lord " ; here, as is evident, there is no question of confidence of pardon but of belief in a revelation. Elsewhere faith is belief in the power of Jesus as miracle-worker ; cf. Mtt. VIII, 3, IX, 28, 29 ; Mk. V, 36, IX, 22, 23 ; Lk. VIII, 50; John IX, 40. In St. John πιστεύω is often explained by the context in the sense of a firm belief in the revelations of Jesus : " If I have spoken to you earthly things and you *believe* not, how will you *believe,* if I shall speak to you heavenly things " (III, 11, 12) ? Elsewhere πιστεύω is equivalent to the recognition of Christ's divine mission to preach the truth or of His Messianic character : " I speak to you, and you *believe* not ; the works that I do in the name of my Father, they give testimony of me. But you do not *believe* because you are not of my sheep " (John X, 25, 26 ; cf. John V, 44, IX, 37, XVI, 30, XIX, 35 ; Lk. XXII, 66, 67). Frequently πιστεύω is intimately connected with the idea of a miracle which serves as the reason of belief ; cf. John III, 2, IV, 4, 8, XI, 14 ; Mk. XV, 32, XVI, 11 ; Lk. XXIV, 41.

2. Art. *Faith,* HDB, vol. I, p. 829.

usually have an explanatory context in which the complement is implicitly contained. To " believe " ordinarily means, in these passages, to accept as the word of God the truths preached by the Apostles. Thus in I Thess. I, 7 the Apostle writes " you became followers of us, and of the Lord, receiving the word in much tribulation, with joy of the Holy Ghost, so that you were made a pattern to all that *believe* " (πιστεύουσιν) in Macedonia and in Achaia ; " You had received of us the word of the hearing of God, " he again tells the Thessalonians, " not as the word of men, but (as it is indeed) the word of God, who worketh in you that have *believed* (πιστεύουσιν). (I Thess. II, 13). " It pleased God, by the foolishness of our preaching to save them that *believe* " (πιστεύοντας) (I Cor. I, 21 ; cf. XV, 11). " The Gospel is the power of God unto salvation to every one that *believeth* " (παντὶ τῷ πιστεύοντι) (Rom. I, 16).

The case where πιστεύω is used with a preposition and the accusative is of even less force against our explanation [1]. For the construction with the dative case, which evidently signifies mere belief, and that with a preposition and the accusative are used indiscriminately by the Apostle. Thus in Rom. IV, 5 we read : τῷ δὲ μὴ ἐργαζομένῳ, πιστεύοντι δὲ ἐπὶ τὸν δικαιοῦντα τὸν ἀσεβῆ, λογίζεται ἡ πίστις αὐτοῦ εἰς δικαιοσύνην, while in VI, 3 it is said : ἐπιστεύσεν δὲ Αβραὰμ τῷ θεῷ καὶ ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσυνην.

But what about the philological principle that the preposition with the accusative always indicates movement — and in our case movement towards Christ — a fact, which would seem to indicate more than a simple belief. This principle, though it may be true for classic Greek, is not valid for New Testament Greek because of a double influence exercised on the latter, the one by the Hebrew and the other by the Κοινή. What the classic Greek ordinarily expressed by the dative, as πιστεύειν τινι, the Hebrew is obliged to render by a preposition. Now the Greek of the New Testament frequently imitates the He-

1. Thus in St. John the accusative and the dative are used indiscriminately. Cf. VIII, 30, 31 : Ταῦτα αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος πολλοὶ ἐπίστευσαν εἰς αὐτόν. ἔλεγεν οὖν ὁ Ἰησοῦς πρὸς τοὺς πεπιστευκότας αὐτῷ Ἰουδαίους ; VI, 29, 30 : ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς. τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ ἔργον τοῦ θεοῦ, ἵνα πιστεύητε εἰς ὃν ἀπέστειλεν ἐκεῖνος. εἶπον οὖν αὐτῷ· τί οὖν ποιεῖς σύ σημεῖον, ἵνα ἴδωμεν καὶ πιστεύσωμεν σοι ; To believe in Christ (εἰς αὐτὸν) is, according to the same Evangelist, to believe in His words ; cf. John VII, 16, 28, 31, 47, 48, VIII, 30, 28, 29, X, 42, XII, 44, 46.

brew construction, either because the Jewish writer unconsciously followed the syntax of his mother-tongue, or because the LXX influenced his style. The Κοινή had much the same influence, for there we notice a growing antipathy for the dative [1]. And if this tendency was characteristic of verbs used to denote local position, *a fortiori* would this be the case for verbs of moral signification as πιστεύω, where the writer was free in his choice of εἰς or ἐν, since the Hebrew had only one preposition (בְּ) to express either the one or the other, and since the classic Greek in the majority of these cases employed no preposition at all. Hence the usage of πιστεύω with the accusative does not betray that " pregnancy " of meaning which modern theologians pretend to find therein.

A further objection against our interpretation might be drawn from the Pauline distinction between " faith " and " works of the law. " The ἔργα νόμου were actions performed in conformity with the Law as this was conceived by the Jews and Judaizers. They were works done without an internal spirit and their sole aim was external legality and the esteem of men. They were acts by which the Jew wished to attain justice not by relying on grace but on his own natural powers (Tit. III, 5 ; Phil. III, 9 ; cf. Eph. II, 9, 10 ; Tit. III, 5-8). They are

1. To conclude from εἰς to the idea of movement is, according to Blass, *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch*², p. 123, to commit an anachronism : " Εἰς hat sich in der Sprache nicht nur behauptet, sondern auch das verwandte ἐν absorbiert : wovon schon im NT. viel vorliegt, wiewohl im Gesamtgebrauche dem stark vertreten εἰς doch noch ἐν beträchtlich überlegen ist. Der klassische Stand : ἐν m. Dat. wo ?, εἰς mit Akk. wohin ? ist schon von Alters her in Dialekten dahin vereinfacht, dass ἐν beide Kasus und beide Funktionen an sich nahm ; die Volkssprache aber ging einen anderen Weg und reduzierte alles auf εἰς m. Akk., für wo ? and wohin ? Von dieser Vermischung die auch bei den LXX und auf ägyptischen Privaturkunden begegnet, hält sich ausser Matth. kein Erzähler des NT frei ". The same author continues on p. 125 : " In anderen Fällen ist die Willkür des Schriftstellers in der Wahl von εἰς oder ἐν nicht zu verwundern, da das Hebr. nur das eine בְּ, das klass Griechisch aber überhaupt keine Präpos. hat. So wechselt πιστεύειν εἰς mit πιστ. ἐν (Mc I, 15) und π. ἐπὶ wozu das klassisch richtige π. τινί kommt ; entspr. Wechsel der Präp. ist bei dem Subst. πίστις (ἡ ἐν Χρ., ἡ εἰς Χρ.). Moulton, art. *Characteristics of New Testament Greek*, Exp., 1904, pp. 465-470, admits the senescene of the dative in the Κοινή but retains nevertheless a distinction between the different constructions of πιστεύω for the Christian language : " To repose one's trust upon God or Christ was well expressed by πιστεύειν ἐπὶ, the dative suggesting more of the state, and the accusative more of the initial act ; while εἰς recalls at once the bringing of the soul into that mystic union which St. Paul loved to express by ἐν Χριστῷ " (p. 470). Reasoning of this kind, needless to say, is *a priori* and lacking in positive proofs.

distinguished from the καλα and ἀγαθά ἔργα, works truly good and supernatural (I Cor. VII, 9 ; II Cor. IX, 8 ; Gal. VI, 10 ; I Tim.V, 10 ; Tit. II, 4). Now it might be argued that if to these Jewish works " faith " alone is opposed : " For we account a man to be justified by faith, without the works of the law " (Rom. III, 28 ; cf. Eph. II, 8, 9 ; Rom. IV, 25, V, 1), faith ought to include not only belief but also that interior spirit and religious sentiments which were absent in the carnal Jew. This difficulty, however, cannot avail the Protestants since it tends to demand as condition of salvation not only " trust ", which for them is the essential element, but also humility, repentance, renunciation of a sinful life, etc., requirements, which the Lutheran theologians would by no means be willing to admit.

Furthermore, the Apostle does not say that we are justified by " faith alone " but " by faith. [1] " The Pauline Epistles, not being didactic treatises, nowhere give a complete enumeration of the conditions of salvation. These are to be found scattered here and there, so that the integral doctrine results only from an *ensemble* of the texts. Hence the Apostle, although in certain passages he attributes justification or salvation directly to faith, explains elsewhere that faith is efficacious and justifying only when informed by charity : " For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision, but faith that worketh by charity " (πίστις δι' ἀγάπης ἐνεργουμένη) (Gal.

1. GARVIE, *Studies of Paul and His Gospel*, p. 267, wrongly maintains that Saint Paul " over against the Judaizers in the Church asserted that man is justified by faith alone ". Equally devoid of Scriptural foundation is the statement of DENNEY, *Christian Doctrine of Reconciliation*, p. 291, " Luther is abundantly right in his emphasis on faith alone ". Cf. also KNOKE, *Der christliche Glaube nach Paulus*, p. 16 f. If Saint Paul in Romans and Galatians insists so much on faith, this was due to the disposition of the Jewish people. The Jew believed that, as a son of Abraham and of the circumcision, he was not a sinner but *eo ipso* had a strict right to the blessing of the Messianic kingdom, a right which, moreover, could not be blotted out even if he did sin. Others who did not err so far believed that they could at least by the observance of the Law acquire a right to recompense which God would acknowledge. Against these pretentions Saint Paul teaches that both Jew and Gentile were sinners, and that true circumcision was purity and sincerity of heart. Hence another way of salvation is to be sought, salvation, namely, by faith. By faith one believes and submits to the dispositions and conditions of salvation which proceed from the infinite wisdom, love, and mercy of God for men, and which are subject to His power. Now it was precisely because this new dispensation was contrary to the Jew's desires, pretentions, and expectations, because it meant the surrender of what was dearest to the Jew, the *lucra* (Phil. III, 4, 7), that the Apostle insisted so much on faith. Cf. JOYCE, *The*

v, 6), and " if I should have all faith, so that I could remove mountains and have not charity, I am nothing " (I Cor. XIII, 2). Again, Saint Paul tells us that we are justified by grace (Rom. III, 24), by baptism (Eph. v, 26 ; Tit. III, 5), by the observance of the commandments (I Cor. VII, 19), and that " we are saved by hope " (Rom. VIII, 24). When several causes concur to produce the same effect, Sacred Scripture attributes this effect now to one and now to the other, without wishing thereby to imply that one of these causes can suffice to the exclusion of the others. Hence in the Pauline expression, " justified by faith, " the term " faith " does not change its meaning nor does it denote but merely presupposes the other dispositions. Faith is the primary requirement of justification, a condition which determines the nature of the whole subsequent process. Whatever else man may do he must first of all believe God's message to man and His promise of supernatural life through Jesus Christ. Apart from faith man does not and cannot know anything of the supernatural end for which God destines him ; revelation alone can make this known to him. Unless he has heard God's message and believes it, it is out of the question that he should take a single step towards its attainment. Hence faith, as the Church tells us, is *the commencement, the foundation, and the root of all justification* [1].

Catholic Doctrine of Grace, p. 136. LATTEY-KEATING, *The Westminster Version of the Sacred Scriptures*, vol. III, App. p. 249 ff. That other conditions besides faith are necessary for justification is clear from what we said above ; but we must not seek the Apostle's *whole* doctrine in every text. The *sola-fides* theory, justification " by faith *alone* ", a term, which Luther arbitrarily inserted in Rom. III, 28, has little vogue to-day. Says HARNACK, *Wesen des Christentums*, p. 180 : " Die sola-fides-theorie hatte zur Folge dasz der gemeine Mann es nicht ungern hörte..... Die Religion ist nicht nur Gesinnung, sondern Gesinnung und Tat, Glaube, der in der Heiligung und in der Liebe tätig ist ". RITSCHL, o. c., vol. III[4], p. 558 : " Demnach ist freilich den römischen Theologen zuzugeben dasz die Liebe zu Gott das Wesen des Glaubens ausmacht ". Cf. also RASHDALL, *The Idea of Atonement*, p. 120.

1: Trid. Sess. VI, cap. 8 (Denz., 801). PRAT, o. c., vol. II[6], p. 281, thus explains the phrase : " La foi est l'*origine* de notre salut parce qu'elle est la première disposition salutaire et que sans elle le pécheur ne peut ni espérer, ni se repentir véritablement, ni aimer Dieu d'un amour sincère. Elle en est le *fondement*, parce que tout le reste s'appuie sur elle ; si elle tombe, tout l'édifice croule avec elle, tandis qu'elle peut se maintenir dans la ruine des autres vertus. Elle en est la *racine ;* non pas qu'elle soit le germe spontané et infaillible des autres dispositions surnaturelles, mais parce qu'elle concourt, avec le secours divin, à les produire et à les soutenir ".

Faith, then, according to Saint Paul, is not a fiduciary faith whereby man " apprehends " the divine justice in order to cover himself with it as with a mantle, but a firm belief in the truths and promises of divine revelation. It is thus the beginning of salvation, because no one can be converted to God unless he recognizes Him as his supernatural end and aim. It is also the foundation of salvation because upon it the other predisposing acts rest securely, being organically united to it. For faith is an active and renovating principle : it produces fear of God's justice, hope of forgiveness, sorrow for sin, the first beginnings of charity, and a resolution to begin a new life by observing the commandments and by receiving baptism ; the sequence of these stages is not inflexible, for it is quite possible for the sinner to pass from faith directly to love [1]. Before proceeding further to examine the question whence faith derives its efficacy, we shall say a few words concerning the origin and object of faith.

II. THE OBJECT, ORIGIN, AND EFFICACY OF FAITH.

A. The formal object of faith, i. e., that which provokes the adhesion of the mind, is always the testimony of God, whether this comes to us immediately or mediately. The difference in the mode of transmission does not change the character of the divine testimony : " when you had received of us the word of the hearing of God, you received it not as the word of men, but (as it is indeed) the word of God, who worketh in you that have believed " (I Thess. II, 13). The Gospel is not the Apostle's own creation, for he had " neither received it of man nor learned it, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ " (Gal. I, 12). Hence the Gospel is the word of God, and to believe the messengers of God is to believe God Himself.

1. As JOYCE, *The Catholic Doctrine of Grace*, p. 121-122, remarks : " It may indeed happen that in some favoured souls faith is immediately followed by love. If that is so, there is for them no need of explicit acts of fear or hope, or even of sorrow for the past : love would supply the place of all. If anyone loves God, his love contains equivalently the hope of gaining God, the fear of losing Him, and regret for past sins. But this case must be reckoned as altogether exceptional. Ordinarily speaking, men climb the ladder of sanctity by degrees. Fear first moves them to forsake sin : then the hope of a future reward exerts an ever increasing influence upon them : and only after this do they recognize that God is more precious than His gifts, and so are led to love Him with their whole heart ".

Frequently the material object is not expressed, and, in that case, is most comprehensive. The Apostle often calls the Christians believers, because faith is not only a profession of the Gospel in all its amplitude but also the universal sentiment which best expresses the character of a Christian. Again, texts are to be found where Saint Paul assigns as the general object of faith, the Apostolic preaching, the Gospel, the truth (II Thess. II, 12, 13 ; I Cor. XV, 1, 2 ; Rom. I, 16, 17, X, 8 ; Phil. I, 27).

If we abstract from the above cases, faith in the Pauline Epistles has two objects, God and Christ. The intellectual content of faith is the certitude that God is faithful to His promises, that He is all powerful to realize them, that He loved us and delivered up His Son for us, that He disposed everything for our salvation ; it is the certitude that Jesus is the promised Messias, the Son of God, that He became our propitiation and redeemed us by the Blood of His Cross, that He was raised from the dead and is now the glorious Lord, that we also shall be raised from the dead, and that nothing can separate us from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus (I Thess. I, 8-10, IV, 13 ; Gal. II, 20, III, 6 ; I Cor. XV, 1-11, 14, 17 ; Rom. III, 25, IV, 3, 5, 17-25, VI, 8, IX, 33, X, 8, 9 ; Col. II, 12). When the material object is God it, as it were, coincides with the formal object, and the expressions to believe God (θεῷ) and in God (ἐπὶ θεῷ, ἐπὶ θεόν, εἰς θεόν), suggest various shades of meaning which are best rendered only by the Greek particles.

This teaching of Saint Paul that Christ is the Object of our faith, has been denied by several modern theologians. Thus according to Shears [1] the " faith of Jesus Christ " is a new power

1. *The Gospel according to St. Paul*, pp. 108, 116, 133 ff. A similar theory had been proposed already in 1891 by HAUSSLEITER, art. *Der Glaube Jesu Christi und der christliche Glaube, ein Beitrag zur Erklärung des Römersbriefs*, NKZ, 1891, pp. 109-145, 205-230. Cf. also by the same author, art. *Eine theol. Disputation über den Glauben Jesu*, NKZ, 1891, pp. 507-520, and SCHLÄGER, art. *Bemerkungen zu* πιστις Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ZNTW, 1906, pp. 356-358, Haussleiter contended that in the expression πίστις Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, the genitive is subjective and not objective, that like the " faith of Abraham " in Rom. IV, 16 (cf. III, 26, 22) it denotes the faith (in God) which Christ Himself maintained even through the ordeal of the Crucifixion, that this faith is put forward as the central feature of the Atonement, and that it is to be grasped or appropriated by the Christian. Haussleiter brings together things, like the πιστις Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ of Rom. III, 22 with the πίστις θεοῦ of III, 3, which are really disparate. Haussleiter's theory was again adopted by KITTEL, art. Πιστις Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ *bei Paulus*, ThSK, 1906, pp. 419-436.

won for man by Him, Who alone has brought it to perfection and Who thus laid hold on the perfect and indefeasible righteousness of God. This faith abides as a regenerating source of life in His mystical body, the Christ. In short, it is the faith of Jesus fulfilling itself as the faith of Christ. Hence this " faith of Christ " is not so much a faith that *looks up* from the believer to Christ as the faith that *comes down* from Christ to the believer. It is not so much the hand by which men lay hold on Christ as the hand by which Christ lays hold on them, enduing them with His power and making them sons of God in Himself. It is a faith which is " in Christ " not so much because Christ is its object as because He is its source. The author distinguishes three stages in the process of justification : first, a preliminary act of faith, which is as it were the human contribution to baptism, and is the natural and necessary prelude to man's taking his stand on the faith of another ; second, baptism, whereby one enters into spiritual fellowship with Christ the Head of the Church, and shares His life ; thirdly, man, by being in Christ through baptism, lays hold of the grace, i. e., of the faith of Jesus Christ by which his own imperfect faith is revived, quickened, perfected, in a word, becomes a justifying faith. Hence to be" in Christ " is to be justified.

A similar theory has been proposed by Deissmann [1]. According to this author faith is not a condition precedent to justification but rather the experience of justification. It is union with God, an unshakeable confidence in His grace, and is brought about by fellowship with Christ. With the Damascus assurance, says the author, of ' Christ in me ', and that other assurance of equal content, ' I in Christ ' , there is concentrated in the deep and to religious impulse extremely sensitive soul of the Apostle an inexhaustible energy. In all directions Saint Paul now radiates ἡ δύναμις τοῦ Χριστοῦ (II Cor. XII, 9) that possesses him, and dispenses τὸ πλοῦτος τοῦ Χριστοῦ (Eph. III, 8), the εὐλογία Χριστοῦ (Rom. XV, 29), and τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ (Eph. IV, 13). To designate this abundant ' power of Christ ' which streamed through him and took effect from him

---

For a criticism of the theory cf. NEELSEN, art. *Hat der Herr Jesus Christus geglaubt ?* NKZ, 1894, pp. 668-676, MEYER, art. *Der Glaube Jesu und der Glaube an Jesum*, NKZ, 1900, pp. 621-644, HILGENFELD, art. *Der Brief des Paulus an die Römer*, ZWT, 1900, pp. 385-407.

1. *St. Paul, a Study in Social and Religious History* (E. T.), p. 139 ff.

Saint Paul employed a well-known technical religious term, the Greek word πίστις, which we are accustomed to translate as " faith. " Faith with Saint Paul is not " faith-in " Christ, but faith " in-Christ, " i. e. something effected in the vital union with the spiritual Christ. The use of the genitive, " of Jesus Christ, " the author further tells us, is very peculiar to the Pauline Epistles, and is not sufficiently explained by the ordinary grammatical scheme of subjective or objective genitive. Hence the need of establishing a peculiar type of genitive, which might be called a " mystic genitive, " because it expresses a mystic state. The " faith of Jesus Christ " then is equivalent to " faith in-Christ. [1] "

What is to be said of this theory ? In the first place, it is true that by baptism we are incorporated into the mystic body and come to participate in Christ's Life. By becoming members of the Church of which Christ is the Head, we are said to be " in Christ " or " in the Spirit. " But Saint Paul never describes our union with Christ and our sharing of His Spirit and power by the term " faith. " Faith precedes our incorporation into Christ by baptism, is intrinsically related to it, but does not merely follow it. Normal and justifying faith, which in the first place is an assent of the intelligence to a supernatural truth, brings about a submission of the whole man to the Gospel, i. e., to the economy of salvation of which God is the author and Christ the herald. This faith necessarily comprises together with the submission to the Divine Will the implicit desire of baptism. Just as the baptism of an adult does not take place without faith since it cannot be conceived without penance and a conversion to God, so also sincere and justifying faith cannot be conceived without the desire of baptism. Hence it is that our supernatural regeneration is attributed now

1. The author also sees the " mystic genitive " in such Pauline expressions as ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ Χριστοῦ (Rom. VIII, 35; II Cor. V, 14 ; Eph. III, 19), ἡ ἐλπὶς τοῦ κύριου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ X. (I Thess. I, 3), ἡ εἰρήνη τοῦ X. (Col. III, 15), πραύτης καὶ ἐπιείκεια τοῦ X. (II Cor. X, 1), σπλάγχνα Ἰ. X. (Phil. I, 8), ἡ ὑπομονὴ τοῦ X. (II Thess. III, 5), ἡ ὑπακοὴ τοῦ X. (II Cor. X, 5), ἀληθεία X. (II Cor. XI, 10), φόβος X. (Eph. V, 21), ἡ περιτομὴ τοῦ X. (Col. II, 11), τὰ παθήματα τοῦ X. (II Cor. I, 5 ; Phil. III, 10), and αἱ θλίψεις τοῦ X. (Col. I, 24). A glance at these passages, however, will convince us that they do not all belong to the same category ; secondly, their particular meaning is to be deduced not from their grammatical construction but from the context and general Pauline doctrine and usage.

to faith, now to baptism, since the act and the rite are mutually connected and exercise a common causality : " For you are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as have been baptized in Christ have put on Christ " (Gal. III, 26, 27). By our union with Christ, therefore, we become children of God, and this union is brought about by faith and baptism.

The term πίστις, consequently, is not used by Saint Paul to denote the supernatural life which, as members of the mystic body, we derive from Christ our Head. But what is to be said of the contention that the phrase, πίστις Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, designates a faith of which Christ is not the Object but the Subject, that it is a faith which Christ brought to full perfection during His mortal career, in order to procure thereby righteousness for us ? Considered from the view point of grammar the subjective genitive is here possible, and this construction might be admissible if πίστις were used by the Apostle to denote Christ's obedience and total oblation of Himself to the Father. However, although Saint Paul at times uses ὑπακοή to denote justifying faith, we have no evidence that he ever used πίστις to designate the moral element of Christ's redeeming work. In fact, the interpretation of πίστις Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ as frequently proposed by modern theologians is only another device for eliminating from Scripture the doctrines of Christ's Divinity and the sinlessness of His nature. For just as we cannot speak of the faith of the Father we cannot speak of the faith of His Son. Νυνὶ δὲ μένει πίστις is meant for us and not for Him Who sits on the right hand of God. He Who, as the Apostle tells us, is true God, " who was predestinated the Son of God by the resurrection " (Rom. I, 14), " who is over all things God blessed forever " (Rom. IX, 5), Who is " the great God and our Saviour " (Tit. II, 13), Who is the image of the invisible God (Col. I, 15), in Whom " dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead corporeally " (Col. II, 9), and Who is the brightness of God's glory, and the figure of his substance " (Heb. I, 3), how can He be said to have believed [1] ?

---

1. If we turn to the Gospels we shall find that Christ always claims for Himself alone knowledge of the Father and of all revelation : " All things are delivered to me by my Father. And no one knoweth the Son but the Father, neither doth anyone know the Father, but the Son, and he to whom it shall please the Son to reveal him " (Mtt. XI, 27) ; " No man hath seen God

Saint Paul never speaks of any faith which Christ had, or proposes it as a model of our own, but, on the contrary, frequently represents Christ as the Object of Christian faith. Thus in Gal. II, 16 he contrasts justification ἐξ ἔργων νόμου and justification ἐξ πίστεως Χριστοῦ, which, in turn, is equivalent to ἡμεῖς εἰς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐπιστεύσαμεν. Again in Col. II, 5 he says: " though I be absent in body, yet in Spirit I am with you, rejoicing and beholding your order, and the steadfastness of your faith which is in Christ " (τὸ στερέωμα τῆς εἰς Χριστὸν πίστεως ὑμῶν). So too he praises Philemon for the faith which he has in the Lord (πίστις ἣν ἔχεις πρὸς τὸν κύριον Ἰησοῦν, v. 5). To the Romans he writes: " if thou confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and believe in thy heart that God hath raised him up from the dead, thou shalt be saved " (Rom. X, 9). In the same Epistle he again says that " God hath proposed Christ to be a propitiation through faith in his blood " (Rom. III, 25), and that as to Abraham so also to us " it shall be reputed unto justice if we believe in him that raised up Jesus Christ our Lord, who was delivered up for our sins and rose again for our justification " (Rom. IV, 24, 25). In Gal. III, 2, 5 Saint Paul says that the Galatian converts had received the Spirit, whereby they were grafted on the mystic Christ, by the *hearing of faith* the object of which was Christ Crucified. To the Corinthians he writes that they will be saved if they keep intact their faith in the Gospel which he preached to them; the contents of this Gospel was the fact that " Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures, that he was buried, and that he rose again on the third day " (I Cor. XV, 1 ff.; II Cor. IV, 13-14). Similarly in I Thess. IV, 13 he says that " if we believe that Jesus died

---

at any time; the only begotten Son who is in the bosom of the Father he hath declared him " (John I, 18). He of Whom it was said that He spoke ὡς ἐξουσίαν ἔχων, Who so frequently and majestically reiterated: ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν, is not a believer who has received revelation, but is rather Himself the Divine Revealer, the revealed Truth itself, the Object of our faith. And if faith be defined as the ἐλπιζομένων ὑπόστασις, πραγμάτων ἔλεγχος οὐ βλεπομένων, and if it be opposed to direct knowing and vision of divine things, it is the latter which the Saviour always vindicated for Himself: " Amen, amen, I say to thee, that we speak what we know, and we testify what we have seen, and you receive not our testimony. If I have spoken to you earthly things, and you believe not, how will you believe if I shall speak to you heavenly things? And no man hath ascended into heaven, but he that descended from heaven, the Son of man who is in heaven " (John III, 11-13).

and rose again, even so them who have slept through Jesus will God bring with him "[1].

The phrase, πίστις Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, does not derive its meaning from the grammatical construction but from the context and from the complete doctrine of the Apostle. If we base ourselves on the latter, we shall find that there is question not of Christ's personal faith but of that of the faithful in Christ as its Object [2]. Moreover, in the Pauline Epistles themselves we find such analogous constructions as " faith of the operation of God " (Col. II, 12, πίστις τῆς ἐνεργείας τοῦ θεοῦ), " faith of the Gospel " (Phil. I, 27, πίστις τοῦ εὐαγγελίου), " faith of the truth " (II Thess. II, 12, πίστις ἀληθείας), expressions, which clearly indicate an objective genitive.

B. Faith which, as we have noted above, is a necessary preparation for baptism, is not a " human contribution " to the latter, but is of supernatural *origin*. Saint Paul in tracing the genesis of faith describes first of all its external causes : " Whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord, shall be saved. How then shall they call on him in whom they have not believed? Or how shall they believe him, of whom they have not heard? And how shall they hear without a preacher? And how shall they preach unless they be sent, as it is written : How beautiful are the feet of them that preach the gospel of peace, of them that bring glad tidings of good things ! But all do not obey the gospel. For Isaias saith : Lord who hath believed our report ? Faith then cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of Christ " (Rom. X, 13-17 ; cf. Rom. X, 17 :

1. From the above it is clear how unfounded is the statement of SHEARS, o. c., p. 56, when he says that Rom. IV, 24 " contains the only *unequivocal* statement to be found in St. Paul's writings of the Object of the faith which justifies Christians ".

2. The above theory has been severely judged by many Protestant theologians. Thus DENNEY, *Christian Doctrine of Reconciliation*, p. 155 (note), writes : In his later work, *Paulus*, Deissmann gives another illustration of what the writer can only regard as a refusal to take Paul's thought seriously. He makes the πίστις Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ — faith in Jesus Christus — " Christusglauben ", not faith of which Christ is the object, but such faith as one can have in God only in virtue of being " in Christ " ; and he even introduces into the grammar, where one had thought himself safe from such phantasmata, what he calls a *genitivus mysticus* to cover this interpretation. So too HILGENFELD art. *Der Brief des Paulus an die Römer* ZWT, 1892, p. 391 : " den Gedanken des gläubigen Jesus Christus und aller nach seinem Vorbilde glaubenden sollte man Rationalisten überlassen und nimmermehr dem Paulus aufdrängen ". NEELSEN, art. *Hat der Herr Jesus Christus geglaubt*, NKZ, 1894,

ἡ πίστις ἐξ ἀκοῆς ; I Thess. II, 13 : λόγος ἀκοῆς ; Gal. III, 2-5 : ἀκοὴ πίστεως). Faith then in its origin is a belief that this message proclaims a truth. The preaching itself is called a " word of hearing " because the first condition of its efficacy is that it be heard.

The preaching which engenders faith is not merely a simple apostolic message, but a discourse rendered efficacious by the power of God's Spirit : " Knowing brethren beloved of God, your election, for our gospel hath not been unto you in word only, but in power also, and in the Holy Ghost, and in much fulness " (I Thess. I, 4, 5). " My speech and my preaching was not in the persuasive words of human wisdom, but in showing of the Spirit and power, that your faith might not stand on the wisdom of men, but on the power of God " (I Cor. II, 4, 5 ; cf. also I Thess. II, 13 ; II Thess. II, 13, III, 2 ; Rom. VIII, 28-30). Faith, therefore, is a grace and gift of God : " For by grace you are saved through faith, and that not of yourselves, for it is the gift of God, not of works, that no man may glory " (Eph. II, 8-9) If salvation by faith is not of us but of God's grace, faith *eo ipso* is also gift of God, or, as the Apostle elsewhere calls it, a fruit of the Spirit (Gal. V, 23 ; cf. Rom. XII, 3 ; I Cor. XII, 9).

C. We have thus far considered the nature of faith and its immediate effects. We have seen what is its genesis and principal object. What role, it might now be asked, does faith exactly play before justification, or, in other words, what is its precise efficacy and causality [1] ? Is it a condition *sine qua non*

---

p. 675 : " Es ist schriftwidrig, es ist gegen alle *analogia Scripturae*, vom Glauben Jesu Christi zu reden, als ob er, der Herr und Gegenstand des Glaubens, geglaubt hätte, ein Glaubender, Gläubiger gewesen wäre und im Glauben gewandelt hätte ". CREMER, *Die Paulinische Rechtfertigungslehre*, p. 316 : " Πίστις ist bei Paulus ein so fest ausgeprägter Begriff zur Bezeichnung des Glaubens, welcher dem Sünder als Gerechtigkeit in Anrechnung gebracht wird, dasz die Hinzufügung des Genetivs dessen, der sonst Objekt des Glaubens ist, auch nur diesen als Objekt desselben, nicht als Subjekt kennzeichnen kann ob man nun einen sogenannten Objektsgenetiv anerkennt oder nicht " Cf. also MEYER, art. *Der Glaube Jesu und der Glaube an Jesum*, NKZ, 1900, pp. 621-644.

1. Cf. LAGRANGE, *Épître aux Romains*, p. 137 ff. According to some of the Reformation theologians faith is the formal cause of justification, i. e., that in which our justification consists. According to others faith justifies by its mere presence, without exercising any influence or causality. At all events, it remains the official doctrine of Protestantism that faith is an ὄργανον ληπτικόν of justification; whether this instrument is purely receptive

without exercising any influence on justification, or is it, on the contrary, a coöperation on the part of man ? The Apostle employs three modes of expression to denote the relation of faith to justification. First of all, it is said that man is justified or that God justifies ἐκ πίστεως (Rom. I, 17, III, 26-30, IV, 16, V, I, IX, 30-32 ; Gal. II, 16, III, 8, II, 22, 24, V, 5). Since God proceeds to justify because man has faith, it follows that faith is a necessary and indispensable preparation. In as far as man is justified ἐκ πίστεως it would seem at first sight that faith is in some way the source of justice, but since the latter is the justice of God faith cannot be its first and primordial source. Secondly, justice is said to be διὰ πίστεως (Rom. III, 22, 25, 30; Gal. II, 16, III, 14-26; Eph. II, 8, III, 12, 17; II Tim. III, 15), an expression in which διὰ with the genitive indicates still more clearly the active role of faith. Thirdly, justification reposes on faith, ἐπὶ πίστει (Phil. III, 9) as on a foundation. If we examine these formulas closely we shall see that faith is not merely an essential condition, whose presence is necessary for some unknown reason, but that it exercices a true causality of the moral order. More exactly, it is not faith which justifies but God Who justifies by faith. Thus faith is neither efficient principal cause, nor formal cause, but only an instrumental cause of our justification. God justifies through faith (διὰ πίστεως) as channel of grace ; He justifies in view of faith (ἐκ πίστεως) as principle of internal renewal, and He justifies on faith (ἐπὶ πίστει) as on a foundation of salvation. Once justified man continues to live ἐν πίστει as in a supernatural atmosphere of which his life henceforth has need (I Cor. XVI, 13; II Cor. XIII, 5 ; Gal. II, 20 ; I Tim. I, 4, II, 15).

---

or whether it implies a certain activity is not clear. In fact, Lutheran theologians usually refuse to examine this point, and Luther himself, when he was approached on this question, burst out in invectives against the infernal and diabolical sophisms of his interrogators. Those who maintain that faith is purely receptive regard it as something passive, as having no moral value, as a condition pure and simple ; and if they wish to be logical, they must also renounce all attempts to explain why faith is pleasing to God and renders Him glory, and why it is required for justification. They content themselves by telling us that faith justifies *per modum apprehensionis*, by laying hold, as it were, of Christ the Redeemer and of His blessings which are offered to us in the Gospel. That in this reasoning there is a flagrant confusion between real and intentional possession is only too evident. Cf. POHLE, art. *Justification*, CE, vol. VIII, pp. 574-576, PRAT, o. c., vol. II[6], p. 536 ff., GOULD, *St. Paul's Use of* δικαιοῦν, AJT, 1897, pp. 149-158.

But we must penetrate yet further into the manner in which faith makes the Christian a participant of justice. For, as we have said above, it is only by a participation in the Life of the Risen Christ that we share in the atoning virtue of Christ's Redemption. If faith in the soteriological events of Our Lord's life produces justice and justification, this can only be in so far as it unites us to Christ and makes us members of His mystic body. This union with Christ is not a mere conformity of life or a mere moral union of the intelligence and will, but a real and mystic union, and the justice which results therefrom rests precisely on a real presence of Christ's Spirit in man. But how can faith produce a union of this kind ? Justifying faith, which in the first place is an assent of the intelligence to a truth, brings about an obedience of the whole man to the economy of salvation, and necessarily comprises the implicit desire of baptism. It is in baptism that we are regenerated, and incorporated into the mystic Christ.

Art. II. — BAPTISM,

If life is activity and influx which the members receive from the head, life in the Spirit begins at the moment when the Christian is incorporated into Christ. We become members of Christ at the very moment that He becomes our Head. Now it is in baptism that we become members of Christ's mystic body, that we become His property and possession. It is in baptism that we assume the manifold relations of filiation in regard to the Father, of mystic identity with Christ and of consecration to the Holy Ghost. The Apostle usually presents baptism to us as a mystic death and resurrection. In baptism we put on Christ, Χριστὸν ἐνδύσασθε [1] (Gal. III,

1. The term ἐνδύεσθαι is frequently employed by Saint Paul in a metaphorical sense. In four passages the word occurs in a figure taken from the armour of a soldier : ἐνδυσώμεθα δὲ τὰ ὅπλα τοῦ φωτός (Rom. XIII, 12), ἐνδύσασθε τὴν πανοπλίαν τοῦ θεοῦ (Eph. VI, 11), ἐνδυσάμενοι τὸν θώρακα τῆς δικαιοσύνης (Eph. VI, 14), and ἐνδυσάμενοι θώρακα πίστεως καὶ ἀγάπης καὶ περικεφαλαίαν ἐλπίδα σωτηρίας (I Thess. V, 8). In these verses where the symbolic element is in the foreground ἐνδύεσθαι implies possession : the virtues are the superior power to which the Christians submit and by which they are transformed. In Col. III, 12 the Apostle says that the Colossians should be possessed and transformed by such virtues as mercy, etc : ἐνδύσασθε οὖν — σπλάγχα οἰκτιρμοῦ, χρηστότητα, ταπεινοφροσύνην, πραύτητα, μακροθυμίαν. In I Cor. XV, 53-54 Saint Paul tells us that the corruptible, i. e., the body, will be possessed and controlled by incorruptibility, that immortality will gain a victory over death :

27; cf. Rom. XIII, 14), are plunged into Him as into a supernatural element and atmosphere, die and rise mystically with Him.

I. BAPTISM A MYSTIC DEATH AND RESURRECTION.

Saint Paul describes baptism, first of all, as a " putting on " of Christ (Gal. III, 27; cf. Rom. XIII, 14). Ἐνδύεσθαι Χριστὸν is to surrender oneself to the power and possession of Christ so as to belong entirely to Him [1]. When we " put on " Christ, He unites us most intimately to Himself so that He actually dwells in us. He conforms us to Himself by making us participate of His Spirit and by elevating us to the dignity of sons of God. The historical fact by which this ἐνδύεσθαι is first effected is our baptism into Christ : " as many as you as have been baptized in Christ, have put on Christ, " ὅσοι γὰρ εἰς Χριστὸν ἐβαπτίσθητε, Χριστὸν ἐνεδύσασθε (Gal. III, 27). In baptism then we submit our whole being to Christ and are intimately bound to Him. But this ἐνδύεσθαι Χριστὸν is to be perfected in our lives, and hence the Apostle exhorts the Romans who had already been baptized : " put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ, " ἐνδύσασθε τὸν κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν (Rom. XIII, 14). By our deeds we must renew our surrender to the will of Christ Whose possession we are by baptism.

The same idea of property, of subjection, and of consecration

---

δεῖ γὰρ τὸ φθαρτὸν τοῦτο ἐνδύσασθαι ἀφθαρσίαν καὶ τὸ θνητὸν τοῦτο ἐνδύσασθαι ἀθανασίαν. A similar figurative use of ἐνδύεσθαι is found in II Cor. V, 2 : " in this also we groan, desiring to be clothed upon (ἐπενδύσασθαι) with our habitation from heaven ", i. e. already in this body we desire to be possessed by the glorified body. In Eph. IV, 22-24 Saint Paul uses ἐνδύεσθαι with a personal object : " put off, according to former conversation, the old man, who is corrupted according to the desire of error. And be renewed in the spirit of your mind, and put on (ἐνδύσασθαι) the new man, who according to God is created in justice and holiness of truth " ; here again the words of Saint Paul bring out the idea of being changed according to the new life, of giving oneself up to the power and possession of the new man. In Col. III, 10 Saint Paul similarly tells us that we should free ourselves from the possession and power of the old life, and surrender ourselves to the new life : " strip yourselves of the old man with his deeds, and put on (ἐνδυσάμενοι) the new, him who is renewed unto knowledge, according to the image of him that created him " The above interpretation of ἐνδύεσθαι seems best to accord with the middle and with LXX usage.

1. The usage of ἐνδύειν with a personal subject and object in the LXX, and in the profane Greek and Κοινή differ in this : the former uses the active,

to the Person of the Lord Jesus, the Head of the Church, is expressed by the formula βαπτίζειν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα (I Cor. I, 13-15). This expression is in turn synonymous with βαπτίζειν εἰς, except that the latter denotes primarily a relation of mystic union and identity. When Saint Paul speaks of baptism εἰς Χριστόν he seems to consider Christ as a sort of divine element or supernatural atmosphere into which we are plunged. Thus in Rom. VI, 4, 5, the result of baptism in Christ (v. 3) is that " we are *buried* together with him by baptism, " συνετάφημεν οὖν αὐτῷ διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος εἰς τὸν θάνατον, and *planted together* with Him, σύμφυτοι (cf Col. II, 12 : συνταφέντες αὐτῷ ἐν τῷ βαπτίσματι). The same idea is found in I Cor. XII, 13, though here the expression is a little different : " in one Spirit were we all baptized into one body, " ἐν ἑνί πνεύματι ἡμεῖς πάντες εἰς ἓν σῶμα ἐβαπτίσθημεν ; we were all baptized into one mystic body because we were all plunged into the same mystic Christ. In Gal. III, 27-28 the result of our baptism in Christ (ὅσοι εἰς Χριστὸν ἐβαπτίσθητε) is the fact that we " put on Christ " (Χριστὸν ἐνεδύσασθε) and were made " all one in Christ Jesus " (πάντες εἷς ἐστε ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ). This sense, however, is derived neither from the verb itself, Βαπτίζειν, which had become a technical term signifying " to confer baptism, " nor from the preposition εἰς, which may denote a simple relation, tendency, end, etc. It is the context alone which induces us to retain for βαπτίζειν its etymological sense of " to

---

and the term means " to take possession of ", while the latter uses the middle, ἐνδύεσθαι, and the term signifies " to surrender to the possession of ", " become the property of ". For the usage of the word in the Hellenic world cf. OHLEYER, *The Pauline Formula " Induere Christum " with Special Reference to the Works of St. John Chrysostom*, p. 56 ff., BURTON, *The Epistle to the Galatians*, p. 204, CREMER, *Wörterbuch der neutestamentlichen Gräcität*[9], p. 376 ff. When the OT uses ἐνδύειν — לָבַשׁ with a personal object, it is used e. g. to denote the fact that the Spirit of God put on some one: Judg. VI, 34 ; πνεῦμα κυρίου ἐνέδυσε τὸν Γεδεών = וְרוּחַ יְהוָה לָבְשָׁה אֶת־גִּדְעוֹן ; cf. I Para. XII, 18; καὶ πνεῦμα ἐνεδύσε τὸν Ἀμασαί ; II Para. XXVI, 20 : καὶ πνεῦμα θεοῦ ἐνεδύσε τὸν Ἀζαρίαν. Hence while it is in the profane Greek that we find a more exact parallel of the Pauline formula, ἐνδύεσθαι Χριστόν, yet in both literatures the fundamental and essential idea of ἐνδύειν — ἐνδύεσθαι is the same: it implies possession and dominion, and involves a change in the possessed by according to the possessor. When ἐνδύειν — ἐνδύεσθαι is used in connection with various qualities and dispositions, the same difference which we have remarked above is to be noted in the profane Greek and LXX usage ; but the meaning remains the same : possession and domination of the person by the disposition. Cf. OHLEYER, o. c., p. 85 ff.

plunge." The same idea underlies the Pauline formula, *in Christo Jesu* [1].

In baptism, as we already noted above, we effectively participate in the blessings which Christ juridically procured for us on Calvary. In it Jesus Christ associates us in a mystic and yet real manner to His Death and Resurrection. By associating us to the former He neutralizes the force of Sin by which the natural man is dominated ; by associating us to the latter He destroys the power of death, and confers upon us life of the soul and life of the body, a life of grace and a life of glory. True, we do not possess a part of these blessings save in hope, yet " hope deceiveth not. "

These profound thoughts and joyful assurances are described by the Apostle in Rom. VI, 3-7 : " Know you not that all we, who are baptized in Christ Jesus, are baptized in his death ? For we are buried together with him by baptism into death that as Christ is risen from the dead by the glory of the Father, so we also may walk in newness of life. For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection. Knowing this, that our old man is crucified with him that the body of sin may be destroyed, to the end that we may serve sin no longer. For he that is dead is justified from sin. " The Apostle is here recalling to his readers something with which they were well acquainted. Baptism in the early Church was generally administered by immersion, and this form of giving the sacrament quite aptly represented the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ. The immersion and submersion in the water was at once an image of Christ's death and burial to this world and of the Christian's death and burial to sin. The total submersion of the Christian was a fitting representation of Christ's envelopment in the tomb. But as Christ died and was buried only to be raised from the dead by the power of His Father, so also we are immersed and submerged in the waters of baptism only to emerge and rise to the new spiritual life of sanctifying grace, and to continue in that new life as Christ continues in His glorious risen state.

(1) To be " baptized into the *death* " of Christ is to be baptized into the dying Christ, to be incorporated into Christ at the very

1. Cf, PRAT, o. c., vol. II[6], pp. 361 ff., 551 ff., DUPERRAY, *Le Christ dans la vie chrétienne d'après saint Paul*[2], p. 86 ff.

moment that He saves us, to die mystically with Him who as the Second Adam suffered death in the name and for the profit of all. Baptism for Saint Paul is not a purely figurative rite and symbol, but really deadens in us the old man, infuses grace into our souls, and really creates in us a new being. As a sacrament it is an efficacious sign which produces *ex opere operato* that which it signifies. Now baptism signifies sacramentally the death of Christ, and hence produces in us a death which though mystic in its essence, is real in its effects, a death, namely, to sin, to the " old man, " and to the Law.

(a) The " death to sin, " which baptism implies, is not a mere invitation to imitate Christ's obedience unto death, nor is it the result of a mere legal fiction so that God considers us as dead to sin although in reality we are not so, nor is it a mere rupture of the will with sin. It implies an interior change of the moral order: to die to sin is to be freed from its stain, delivered from its tyranny, and placed in a position where we can overcome its further sollicitations. All sin whether actual or original, disappears at baptism. Formerly we knew by sad experience what it meant to be under the Law. But under the new law of grace there is no condemnation to the faithful who by means of baptism have been incorporated into Christ Jesus (Rom. VI, 3 ff.), and as members of His body live henceforth of His life (Rom. VI, 11, 23 ; I Cor. XII, 13 ; Gal. II, 20 ; cf. John XIV, 19, 20) : " There is now no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus " (Rom. VIII, 1). By the waters of baptism we were cleansed from all stain of sin, and received sanctifying grace, the theological and moral virtues, and the gifts of the Holy Ghost. We were not only called but actually rendered just. Whereas before our conversion we were enemies of God and slaves of sin, we are now God's friends and adopted sons : " You are washed, you are sanctified, you are justified (ἀπελούσασθε, ἡγιάσθητε, ἐδικαιώθητε) in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the Spirit of our God " (I Cor. VI, 11) ; " God saved us by the laver of regeneration, and renovation of the Holy Ghost, whom he hath poured forth upon us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Saviour, that being justified by his grace, we may be heirs, according to hope of life everlasting " (Jit. III,5-7).

(b) Again, through baptism our old man, i. e. our sinful nature, which we inherited from the first Adam and which made us

slaves to sin, has been nailed to the cross of Christ, in order that we may lead a new life of sanctity: " Our old man is crucified with him, that the body of sin may be destroyed, to the end that we may serve sin no longer. " (Rom. VI, 6). The Apostle, as we know, distinguished in us two men, the old and the new, or rather two different states, one in which we are slaves to sin by reason of the Sin-principle which dominates over the natural man, the other in which we live as sons of God in the liberty and under the influence of the Spirit (Eph. IV, 22-24 ; Col. III, 9). This death to the " old man " is progressive since the tendency to evil persists even in the regenerated man. But with the aid of grace, concupiscence, of which the body is a vehicle and instrument, is rendered powerless and inoffensive. For Christ, the Second Adam, died on the Cross to destroy the dominion of sin over us. He took upon Himself our sins and died for us. In baptism the merits of His passions are applied to our soul.

(c) By our mystical death with Christ, we are also liberated from the regime of the Law, which, by increasing our responsibility and failing at the same time to give the necessary strength for the fulfilment of what it commanded, was the occasion of sin and death. " But now, " says the Apostle, " we are loosed from the law of death, wherein we were detained, so that we should serve in newness of spirit, and not in the oldness of the letter " (Rom. I, 6). The purpose of the liberation from the Old Law is that we should serve God according to a new principle of life, namely, the grace of the Holy Spirit (Rom. V, 15 ; VIII, 15 ; Gal. IV, 6). The new state then is one of the Spirit, the old state was regulated by written law ; the former is a period of the Paraclete, the latter took its character from the Sinaitic legislation ; the former turns on an inspiration from above, the latter on an elaborate code of commands and prohibitions. The Law in fact was intended to lead to Christ. By its innumerable precepts and exactions which the natural man could not fulfill it brought its subjects to a state of moral and spiritual death. By the very burden and inadequacy of the Law man was forced to seek refuge in God through Christ. Hence the Law became useless and dead, or man died to it when he was united to Christ in baptism. " Through the law " says Saint Paul, " I am dead to the Law " (Gal. II, 19).

(2) The Apostle always establishes a close connection between

this spiritual death and the resurrection. Baptism for him is not only a death but also the entrance into an immortal and indefectible life. In this regard the baptismal rite has equal efficacy in symbolizing and reproducing the resurrection and glorified life of Christ. For Christ is our Head, and we are united to Him after the manner of a graft on a tree so as to form one growth with Him : " For if we have been planted together (σύμφυτοι) in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection... if we be dead with Christ, we believe that we shall live also together with Christ " (Rom. VI, 5, 8). The Apostle here speaks primarily of our present moral renovation and life of grace in this world, and only secondarily of our future resurrection which is a natural sequel to our actual spiritual life in Christ. This new life may not be apparent but it is a necessary corollary of our death : " For you are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God " (Col. III, 3). And how could it be otherwise since baptism is not only the sepulchre of the old man but also the womb of the new : " Buried with him in baptism, in whom also you are risen again by the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him up from the dead " (Col. II, 12). God desires and gives us the grace that this new life may endure forever, and that ultimately grace be turned into glory. On our part, it depends on our free will whether we wish to preserve the new life or not. Hence the Apostle, after having spoken so forcefully about the exalted life of Christians who through baptism have died and risen to a life of sanctity with the risen Christ, exhorts his readers to be ever on their guard against sin, lest, resting too confidently in their new estate of grace, they become careless and again fall under its tyrannical sway. He warns them against the thought that, being freed from the slavery of the Law, they may now sin with impunity. On the contrary, as before they served sin unto death, they most now serve justice unto life eternal (Rom. VI, 12-23).

By baptism, then, the Christian is, as it were, plunged into Christ as into a supernatural element and atmosphere (Rom. VI, 4, 5 ; Col. II, 12 ; I Cor. 12, 13), and is mystically united to Him. By becoming a member of the body of which Christ is the Head, he comes to participate in Christ's Spirit. Being united with Christ, he is reconciled to God, delivered *en principe* from death, justified ; he is regenerated and freed henceforth

from the tyrannical power of Sin. The Apostle employs various analogies to express our incorporation into Christ and our becoming members of the Church. Sometimes he speaks of the Christian community, of which Christ is the Head, as a spiritual building, now again as the Spouse of Christ, and more especially as the mystic body. Before we proceed to consider these various conceptions, we must consider once more the relation of baptism and faith.

II. BAPTISM AND FAITH.

According to certain Protestant scholars as Holtzmann [1] and Heitmüller [2] there are two almost irreconcilable currents of thought in the Pauline Epistles, namely, that of faith and that of baptism; to the former belong such conceptions as justification and remission of sins, to the latter such ideas as sanctification and mystic union with Christ. Others, who attempt a reconciliation, unduly emphasize either the role of baptism at the expense of faith, or vice versa. Thus according to Shears [3] and Deissmann [4] baptism has a real efficacy and communicates grace to us, and justifying faith itself is only a fruit of baptism. For Juncker [5] baptism is the means of communicating grace to us but it is faith which appropriates this grace; faith is the apprehensive cause, the ὄργανον ληπτικόν of the salvation which is in Christ. For Denney [6] baptism is merely a "rite in which faith is declared," it is "an illustration of faith, a picture in which the contents of faith are presented to the eye." And the author continues: "baptism is a picture of death, burial, and resurrection. These things are in baptism as in a picture, but they are in faith in their reality. What is in the picture for the eye to see is in faith as the experience of the soul. We were baptized into Christ's death, means that when we were baptized our faith was evoked by and concentrated on that death; in its atoning power, a power which belongs to it because it is really our death borne by Him, it takes hold of us and con-

1. *Lehrbuch der neutestamentlichen Theologie*², p. 195-199.
2. *Taufe und Abendmahl bei Paulus*, 22-23, 33-36.
3. *The Gospel according to St. Paul*, pp. 108, 116, 133 ff.
4. *S. Paul, a Study in Social and Religious History*, p. 143.
5. *Die Ethik des Apostels Paulus*, p. 114 ff.
6. Art. *The Righteousness of God and the New Life*, Exp., 1901, pp. 299-311.

forms us to itself ; we make it our own in the very act of believing, and in Christ through faith we die to sin. This is the faith which baptism presents to the senses [1] ".

Before examining some of the particular Pauline texts which are adduced by these authors, we shall first of all make a few general remarks in regard to the above difficulties. The false dualism which Protestant scholars everywhere and at all cost want to introduce into Saint Paul is due to the fact that they have not sufficiently penetrated the Apostle's doctrine concerning Sin and that they minimize, if they do not suppress, the role of the Resurrection, which, as we have said above, is an essential complement of the Redemption. Again, there is the external bond of synchronism between faith and baptism, since most of the Christian converts to whom the Apostle's letters were directed had received the gift of baptism shortly after that of faith (cf. Acts II, 41 ; VIII, 38 ; XIV, 33 ; XVIII, 8 ; XIX, 5) ; hence there was an identity of the two souvenirs. Justifying and normal faith, which for the Apostle was first of all an assent to a supernatural truth, brought about an obedience of the whole man to the Gospel, to the new economy of salvation. This faith necessarily comprised together with the submission of oneself to God, the implicit desire of baptism. Just as the baptism of an adult cannot be conceived without faith since it presupposes penance and a conversion to God, so also sincere and justifying faith cannot be conceived without the desire of baptism. Hence it is that the Apostle attributes justice, life, salvation, adoptive filiation, and spiritual regeneration, now to faith and now to baptism, since the two are mutually dependent and exercise a common causality.

In Gal III, 26, 27, the Apostle says : " For you are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus, for as many of you as have been baptized in Christ, have put on Christ " (πάντες γὰρ υἱοί θεοῦ ἐστε διὰ τῆς πίστεως ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ· ὅσοι γὰρ εἰς Χριστὸν ἐβαπτίσθητε, Χριστὸν ἐνεδύσασθε). Here on the one hand the act of " putting on " Christ, the cause of filiation, is clearly attributed to baptism, while, on the other hand, adoption is attributed to faith as to its instrumental cause. Does the Apostle then assign a distinctive causality to faith and to baptism? or does he mean to say that faith alone is active in baptism while the latter is reduced to a mere symbolism ? In

1. O. c., p. 308.

answer it must be noted that faith for Saint Paul denotes not only the act of believing, but also the condition of the Christian who accepts the new economy and unites himself to Christ (cf. Gal. II, 20 ; I Cor. XVI, 13 ; II Cor. I, 23, XIII, 5 ; Col. I, 23 ; II, 7 ; I Tim. II, 15). The pedagogical servitude of the Law, he says (Gal. 3, 25), comes to an end with Christ, it disappears when with Christ the economy of faith begins. By becoming Christians, we indeed become sons of God through faith in Jesus Christ. The Apostle thereupon indicates by what special act of the Christian life, of that new condition which is that of faith, the divine filiation is obtained : it is by baptism in which we " put on " Christ [1].

The Apostle's affirmation in Gal. II, 19, 20, is likewise adduced to show that faith alone is the active principle of union with Christ, so that there is no place left for a real and efficient causality of baptism. In this passage the Apostle says : ἐγὼ γὰρ διὰ νόμου νόμῳ ἀπέθανον ἵνα θεῷ ζήσω. Χριστῷ συνεσταύρωμαι. ζῶ δὲ οὐκέτι ἐγώ, ζῇ δὲ ἐν ἐμοὶ Χριστός. ὃ δὲ νῦν ζῶ ἐν σαρκί, ἐν πίστει ζῶ τῇ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἀγαπήσαντός με καὶ παραδόντος ἑαυτὸν ὑπερ ἐμοῦ. The two expressions ζῇ δὲ ἐν ἐμοὶ Χρίστος and ἐν πίστει ζῶ are said to be not only parallel but fundamentally identical ; the indwelling of Christ is not only realized by faith but resolves itself into faith. That Saint Paul considers as an effect of faith the union of the faithful with Christ and the indwelling of Christ in the soul, we have acknowledged above ; but this faith far from excluding baptism supposes it and leads to it. For it is because faith tends essentially to baptism that it itself is effective. Saint Paul in becoming a Christian associated himself by baptism to the death of Christ ; with Him he died to the Law, to sin, and to himself. But he also rose with Christ,and henceforth Christ lives in him. Hence it is that being still in the flesh he no longer lives according to the flesh but for God. Before baptism he led an external

1. CORNELY, *Epistolae ad Corinthios altera et ad Galatas*, p. 516, remarks: " Uti justificationis, ita adoptionis nostrae fundamentum quidem et radix est fides ; ipsa vero justificatio et adoptio est effectus baptismi, quo gratia sanctificante et caritate infusa Spiritum Filii clamantem Abba Pater (IV, 4) credentes velut adoptionis sigillum in cordibus suis recipiunt. Haud sine ratione autem Apostolus dicit : qui *in Christum* baptizati estis ; per baptismum enim fideles Christo consecrari ac devoveri ac sese in ejus proprietatem tradere innuit. Qui vero per baptismum se totos Christo tradunt, illis vicissim Christus quoque se tradit ; illos quippe in se transformat ; et hoc est, quod Apostolus verbis *Christum induistis* significat. "

natural life, now he leads an interior supernatural life which is had by faith in Christ, who loved him and delivered Himself for him. Hence he will not render the grace of God in vain by placing himself anew under the yoke of the Law.

Similar objections are sometimes based on Col. II, 10-13, and Eph. II, 4-8; in the former the Apostle says: "In whom also you are circumcised with circumcision not made by hand, in despoiling of the body of the flesh, but in the circumcision of Christ, buried with him in baptism, in whom also you are risen again by the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him up from the dead" (συνταφέντες αὐτῷ ἐν τῷ Βαπτίσματι, ἐν ᾧ καὶ συνηγέρθητε διὰ τῆς πίστεως τῆς ἐνεργείας τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἐγείραντος αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν). In Eph. II, 4-8, the rite of baptism is not formally mentioned, but is certainly understood: "But God (who is rich in mercy), for his exceeding charity wherewith he loved us, even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together in Christ (by whose grace you are saved,) and hath raised us up together, and hath made us sit together, in the heavenly places through Christ Jesus... for by grace you are saved through faith" (διὰ πίστεως). Here again, faith is mentioned together with baptism. What, then, is its purpose? Is the resurrection with Christ in baptism operated by faith, so that it alone is the active and efficacious element in baptism? In answer we would note that these same effects are elsewhere attributed to baptism in so far as a sacramental rite, independently of faith which is not even mentioned. Saint Paul considers baptism as an efficacious rite producing what it signifies, i. e., association to the death and resurrection of Christ (Rom. VI, 3 ff.). When the Apostle determines the moral perfection which should be the aim of Christians, it is ordinarily on the realities of baptism and not on those of faith that he bases the new obligations (Rom. VI; Col. II, 20-23). This fact clearly shows that the mystical death and resurrection of the Christian do not spring from faith alone, but from faith, the obedience of the whole man to the economy of salvation, which culminates in the reception of baptism. In I Cor. VI, 11 these effects are attributed in an even more precise way to the particular inaugural act of the new economy: "you are washed, you are sanctified, you are justified in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the Spirit of our God."

Faith and baptism are, therefore, mutually dependent, and exercise a common causality. It is only when faith has an intrinsic relation to baptism that it itself becomes effective. By baptism we are incorporated into Christ and enter into possession of the effects of the Redemption. Before describing these various blessings which are ours by the participation of Christ's Spirit, let us first briefly examine the various analogies by which the Apostles expresses our incorporation into and union with Christ.

CHAPTER II.

Incorporation into Christ — the Church.

From the very moment of his conversion Saint Paul had a profound conviction of the intimate union which exists between Christians and Christ. The appearance on the road to Damascus, in which the persecuting Pharisee came to know that Jesus was, as it were, hid behind the persecuted Christians of Judea, placed the fact of this union clearly before his eyes. This idea of the Christians' union with Christ appears frequently in the Pauline Epistles : sometimes it is rapidly alluded to, sometimes it is developed more precisely, and at other times it is merely recalled for the occasion. Frequently, as in First Corinthians, it is the underlying idea of the Apostle's reasoning. Thus, there are divisions in the Church of Corinth ; this abuse, the Apostle says, must be suppressed since a schism between Christians in equivalent, in virtue of the union which exists between Christ and the faithful, to a division of Christ Himself (I Cor. I, 10-13). Again, fornication must be avoided since it is altogether incompatible with the Christian's union with Christ (I Cor. VI, 15-17 ; cf. V, 1-6). The Corinthians must not scandalize a weak brother for to do so would be to sin against Christ (I Cor. VIII, 11-13). They must avoid idolatry, because all sacrifice is communication with the divinity to which sacrifice is offered; now the union of the Christian with Christ is such that communion with the demon by a pagan sacrifice is for the former equivalent to prostitution (I Cor. X, 18-21). When the same Corinthians are anxious concerning the resurrection, the Apostle assures them that our union with Christ our Head is an absolute guarantee that we too shall rise with Him (I Cor. XV, 12-24). This doctrine of the ineffable union of the Christians with and in Christ gives rise to a certain number of expressions which are characteristically Pauline and which are not easily rendered into English [1]. At other times the same idea of our incorporation

1. e. g. συμπάσχειν *(compati,* Rom. VIII, 17 ; I Cor. XII, 26).
συσταυροῦσθαι *(simul crucifigi,* Rom. VI, 6 ; *configi cruci,* Gal. II, 20).
συναποθνήσκειν *(commori,* II Tim. II, 11 ; II Cor, VII, 3).

into Christ is expressed by certain analogies, the most important of which is that of the mystic body.

Art. I. — ANALOGIES OF THE CHURCH. — THE MYSTIC BODY.

I. A favorite Pauline representation of the symmetry and unity of the Church is that of a spiritual building. The Apostle in evolving this metaphor recalls the former unhappy condition of the Gentiles. He describes the state of the Asiatic Christians before their conversion, as one of alienation from the commonwealth of Israel and estrangement from the covenants of the promise: " Wherefore remember that you being heretofore gentiles in the flesh,who are called uncircumcision by that which is called circumcision in the flesh, made by hands, that you were at that time without Christ, being aliens from the conversation of Israel, and strangers to the testament, having no hope of the promise, and without God in this world " (Eph. II, 11-12).

This enmity between man and God endures no longer because it has been abolished in Christ: " And you when you were dead in your sins and the uncircumcision of the flesh, God hath quickened with him, forgiving you all offences, blotting out the handwriting of the decree that was against us, which was contrary to us. And he hath taken the same out of the way, fastening it to the cross " (Col. II, 13-14). Henceforth there will be only one new humanity in which God and man will be mutually reconciled. To a knowledge of this new manhood all

---

συνθάπτεσθαι *(consepeliri,* Rom. VI, 4 ; Col. II, 12).
συνεγείρειν *(convessuscitare,* Eph. II, 6 ; Col. II, 12 ; III, 1).
συζῆν or συνζῆν *(simul vivere cum,* Rom. VI, 8 ; *convivere,* II Tim. II, 11 ; cf. II Cor. VII, 3).
συζωοποιεῖν *(convivificare,* Eph. II, 5 ; Col. II, 13).
συμμορφίζεσθαι *(configurari,* Phil. III, 10).
συνδοξάζεσθαι *(conglorificari,* Rom. VIII 17).
συγκαθίζειν *(consedere facere,* Eph. II, 6).
συμβασιλεύειν *(conregnare* II Tim. II, 12 ; cf. I Cor. IV, 8).
συμμόρφος *(conformis* Rom. VIII, 29 ; Phil. III, 21).
σύμφυτος *(complantatus,* Rom. VI, 5).
συγκληρονόμος *(coheres,* Rom. VIII, 17 ; Eph. III, 6.

Cf. Duperray, o. c., pp. 6-7, Prat, art. *L'idée mère de la théologie de saint Paul,* Études, 1900, pp. 203-223. Knoke, *Der christliche Glaube nach Paulus,* p. 40.

are being gradually brought by the "preaching of peace," i. e., of the Gospel: "But now in Christ Jesus, you who sometime were afar off, are made nigh by the blood of Christ. For he is our peace, who hath made both one, and breaking down the middle wall of partition, the enmities in his flesh, making void the law of commandments contained in decrees, that he might make the two in himself into one new man, making peace, and might reconcile both to God in one body by the cross, killing the enmities in himself. And coming he preached peace to you that were afar off, and peace to them that were nigh. For by him we have access both in one Spirit to the Father" (Eph. II, 13-18).

When we turn from the negative to the positive statements of the Apostle, we find that he pictures the new converts as enjoying four new privileges: ἄρα οὖν οὐκέτι ἐστὲ ξένοι καὶ πάροικοι [1], ἀλλὰ ἐστέ συνπολῖται τῶν ἁγίων καὶ οἰκεῖοι τοῦ θεοῦ, εποικοδομηθέντες ἐπί τῷ θεμελίῳ τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ προφητῶν [2], ὄντος ἀκρογωνιαίου αὐτοῦ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ, ἐν ᾧ πᾶσα οἰκοδομὴ [3]

---

1. The term ξένος denotes a "foreigner" in general. Πάροικος is a foreigner in a state, and not having rights of citizenship. The reference to the πολιτεία of Israel shows that the ἅγιοι are those who constitute the people of God; such formerly had been the Jews, but now are all Christians. These are now the Israel of God (Gal. VI, 16; cf. III, 7, 16; Rom. IV, 16). The οἰκεῖοι τοῦ θεοῦ are those belonging to the οἶκος or household of God, the theocracy regarded as a family (cf. I Tim. III, 15; Heb. X, 20; I Pet. IV, 17). Εποικοδομηθέντες (aorist) refers to the time when they became Christians.

2. Is there question here of Old or New Testament prophets? Formerly it was usually held that they are OT prophets. Cf. PRAT, o. c., vol. II[6], p. 340, VAN STEENKISTE, *Commentarius in S. Pauli epistolas*[6], vol. II, p. 33. The opposite opinion seems now to be more prevalent, and is perhaps the more probable one. It is true of course that the NT is founded on the prophets, but that meaning can hardly be found in the present passage. In favor of the other opinion we may adduce: a) the parallel passages in Eph. III, 5, IV, 11 b) absence of the article before προφητῶν; this argument however is not decisive since the OT prophets and the apostles might possibly be regarded as constituting one class, though this would hardly be natural; c) the order of the words: this is not sufficiently accounted for by the superior dignity of the apostles who saw and heard Christ; d) high dignity of the apostles and prophets in the primitive Church: cf. Rom. XII, 28 ff., XIV, 29, 32, 37; Acts XI, 27, XIII, 1, XV, 32, XXI, 10. Cf. KNABENBAUER, *Epistolae ad Ephesios, ad Philippenses, et ad Colossenses*, pp. 89-90, HITCHCOCK, *The Epistle to the Ephesians*, pp. 208-209, VOSTÉ, *Commentarius in epistolam ad Ephesios*, p. 152, ABBOTT, *Ephesians and Colossians*, pp. 71-72.

3. Πᾶσα οἰκοδομὴ does not denote "every church", for to speak of the several churches as so many several buildings would not be in accordance with the figure in v. 20. By speaking of several buildings the Apostle would weaken

συναρμολογουμένη αὔξει εἰς ναὸν ἅγιον ἐν κυρίῳ, ἐν ᾧ καὶ ὑμεῖς συνοικοδομεῖσθε εἰς κατοικητήριον τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν πνεύματι (Eph. II, 19-22 ; cf. Rom. V, 18, VII, 3, 25, VIII, 12, IV, 18, XIV, 19 ; Gal. VI, 10 ; I Thess. V, 6).

First of all, then, the Gentiles are citizens in the holy state, the commonwealth of a people consecrated to God. They enjoy a rank of dignity not inferior to that of the Jews, and need not be circumcised (cf. Gal. III, 3, 7, 9, 29). Whereas formerly they were strangers and sojourners τῆς πολιτείας Ἰσραήλ, now they are συνπολῖται τῶν ἁγίων, i. e., fellow-citizens with full rights. They are intelligent participators in a common corporate life consecrated to God.

Secondly, whereas formerly they were ἄθεοι, they now belong to the family of God and share in the blessings of His household. In this supernatural family they are sons and not servants, heirs and not slaves. Hence it is that the Apostle speaks with horror of the Christians' allowing themselves to be subject again to ordinances, to the " weak and beggarly " elements, to that alphabet of earlier education when even children are treated as slaves : " how turn you again to the weak and needly elements, which you desire to serve again ? You observe days, and months, and times and years. I am afraid of you lest perhaps I have laboured in vain among you " (Gal. IV, 9-11). " You died with Christ to your old life, " he again tells the Colossians. " All mundane relations have ceased for you. Why then do you — you who have attained your spiritual manhood — submit still to the rudimentary discipline of children ? Why do you — you who are citizens of heaven — bow your necks afresh to the tyranny of material ordinances, as though you were still living in the world " (cf. Col. II, 20 ff.) ?

Thirdly, they are being built together into a building or sanctuary in order that God may dwell therein. Of this holy structure the foundation-stones are the Apostles and their companions, the Christian prophets. Its corner-stone is Christ

---

the forcible figure which he had just used to express the unity of the whole Church. The figure in I Cor. III, 16 where the believer is spoken of as a ναὸς θεοῦ is founded on the conception of the indwelling of the Spirit ; but this is different from calling every believer an οἰκοδομή. The English words, " all the building ", though ambiguous, seem best to express the idea. The image is that of several parts so adjusted to one another as to preserve the unity of design.

Jesus [1] : " Behold I will lay a stone in the foundation of Sion, a tried stone, a corner stone, a precious stone, founded in the foundation " (Is. XXVIII, 16).

Finally, from the metaphor of a building the Apostle passes to that of a living plant [2]. The Church as a visible organization of men, can be what it is — the commonwealth of God, His household, and His sanctuary — only because it is pervaded by the Life of Christ. The stones of the building are not merely placed side by side of another, but they are the branches of a living tree, the limbs of a living body. This same thought we shall meet again in the Apostle's conception of the Church as a mystic body.

II. The union which exists between the Christian and Christ is again compared by the Apostle to that which exists between husband and spouse : " Let women be subject to their husbands as to the Lord, because the husband is the head of the wife, as Christ is the head of the church ; he is the saviour of his body. Therefore as the church is subject to Christ, so also let the wives be to their husbands in all things. Husbands, love your wives, as Christ also loved the church, and delivered himself up for it, that he might sanctify it, cleansing it by the laver of water in the word of life (ἵνα αὐτὴν ἁγιάσῃ καθαρίσας τῷ λουτρῷ τοῦ

1. According to VAN STEENKISTE, o. c., p. 33, the " chief corner-stone " " ille est qui in superiore parte fundamenti positus *(summus)*, 1° duos parietes ex diverso latere venientes *(angularis)* conjungit et sustinet ; 2° qui ipsimet fundamento firmitatem praestat, quum mediante illo lapide murus super fundamentum solidius exstruatur ; 3° ideo etiam lapis ille ceteris major et durior esse debet ; et 4° occupat locum conspicuum, nimirum ad summam soli superficiem, quum e contrario fundamentum sit intra solum, ab oculis remotum. Igitur ex omnibus aedificii lapidibus, primarius est et utilissimus, imo vero adeo necessarius ut sine eo tota rueret fabrica, nihilque prodesset ipsum fundamentum. Haec omnia Christo, et ipsi soli, perfectissime conveniunt ; ipse enim duos populos, Judaeum et ethnicum in unum populum Christianum conjungit ". To explain the figure of the corner-stone as uniting two walls, namely, the Jews and Gentiles, is perhaps to press the figure unduly. For the point is that the Jews and Gentiles are indifferently built into the one building, not as if the Jews were one wall and the Gentiles another.

2. The tenses of the verbs are particulary noteworthy in this connection, for they seem to indicate the progress of the building, the gradual development of this Divine and spiritual structure. The Christians have been definitely placed on the foundation (ἐποικοδομηθέντες, Eph. II, 20), they have been permanently founded (τεθεμελιωμένοι, III, 17), they are continually being built together and fitted together harmoniously in the process of building (συναρμολογουμένη, αὔξει, συνοικοδομεῖσθε, II, 21, 22), so that the whole building will be one perfect outcome of a continuous increase and growth (II, 21 ; cf. IV, 12, 16).

ὕδατος ἐν ῥήματι [1]), that he might present it to himself a glorious church, not having spot or wrinkle, or any such thing, but that it should be holy and without blemish. So also ought men to love their wives as their own bodies. He that loveth his wife, loveth himself. For no man ever hated his own flesh, but nourisheth and cherisheth it, as also Christ doth the church " (Eph. v, 22-30).

In this passage we may note the following theological and profoundly rich ideas concerning Christ's relation to the Church : first, there is Christ's love for the Church which involves a purpose of entire sanctification for her ; secondly, there is sacrifice, the sacrifice of Himself for her; thirdly, there is the baptismal purification of the Church to fit her for Christ, for by baptism the individual members of the Christian body are cleansed from the stains of sin, " put on " Christ, and share in His Spirit, and, lastly, there is Christ's final presentation to Himself of the Church in its sinless and stainless perfection. Now if such be the union between Christ and the Church it is evident that it is far more perfect than that which exists between husband and wife : it is more intimate, because we are members of Christ's body, while husbands should love their wives as their own body ; it is more affectionate, since Christ so loved the Church that He even gave Himself for it, and, finally, it involves a more complete dependence since the submission of the Church to Christ is presented as the model of that which the spouse ought to realize in regard to her husband. Hence the analogy of marriage is incomplete and incapable of

1. Ἁγιάσῃ includes the actual sanctification or infusion of holiness. It is the positive side, καθαρίσας expressing the negative, the purification from former sins. Though logically καθαρίζειν precedes ἁγιάζειν, chronologically they are coincident. τῷ λουτρῷ τοῦ ὕδατος distinctly refers to baptism, with a probable allusion in λουτρῷ to the usual bath of the bride before the marriage (cf. also Tit. III 5 : διὰ λουτροῦ παλινγενεσίας ; I Cor. VI, 11 ; Acts X, 47, Heb. X, 12 ; I Pet. III, 21). The words ἐν ῥήματι are best connected with καθαρίσας. As to the meaning of ῥῆμα some take this to mean the Gospel or preached word, taught preliminary to baptism (cf. Rom. X, 17, ῥῆμα Χριστοῦ ; Eph. VI, 17, ῥῆμα θεοῦ; Heb. VI, 5, θεοῦ ῥῆμα; cf. also Acts X, 44, XI, 14, XXVI, 25). But there is no example of ῥῆμα by itself meaning " the Gospel " or anything like this ; had it the article here, there might be reason for maintaining this interpretation. The Greek commentators understood ῥῆμα of the formula of baptism (cf. Mtt. XXVIII, 19). The objection that ῥῆμα has not elsewhere this meaning does not hold, since we do not pretend that ῥῆμα of itself means the formula of baptism ; it retains its indefinite meaning, and it is only the connection with the reference to baptism in the preceding words that defines what ῥῆμα is intended. Cf. Vosté, o. c., p. 226.

expressing fully the great mystery of Christ's union with His spiritual community. The metaphors of the building and of the bride bring us to another analogy, more original and more profound, namely, that of the mystic body.

III. The Apostle frequently speaks of Christ in two different manners : at one time he speaks of Him in the ordinary way as did the Apostles and Evangelists, at another he regards Him in a way peculiar to himself. According to the former viewpoint Christ is the Son of God, Who became Incarnate, Who died and rose from the dead for us ; according to the latter He is the Head of the mystic Christ whose members are all vivified by His Spirit. Hence the natural Christ as Victim of Calvary is a part — and the principal one — of the mystic Christ though not the entire mystic Christ. The natural Christ died for us, reconciled us to the Father, and redeemed us. The mystic Christ sanctifies us, lives in us, and unites us in Himself ; it is Jesus the Spouse with the Church His Bride, it is the Church completing its Head and completed by Him. In fact, the Church is as it were the prolongation of Christ into time and space. It is the complement of its Head, Who, in turn, completes Himself in the members of the sacred hierarchy and in the simple faithful [1].

1. PRAT, o. c., vol. II[6], p. 344, remarks : " Si on l'appelle *mystique* ce n'est pour lui dénier les propriétés réelles, c'est pour le distinguer du corps *physique* pris par le Verbe au sein de Marie, pour marquer son rapport avec ce que Paul nomme le *Mystère*, et surtout pour exprimer certaines propriétés *mystérieuses* de l'ordre surnaturel qui, parce qu'elles échappent à la vérification de l'expérience sensible, n'en sont pas moins des réalités. Il y a dans ce composé merveilleux action réelle de la tête sur tous et sur chacun des membres, réaction des membres les uns sur les autres par la communion des saints, compénétration réelle du Saint-Esprit, qui vivifie tout le corps et y forme le plus parfait des liens, la charité. Ce qui distingue essentiellement le corps mystique des entités morales, qu'on décore par abus du nom de corps, c'est qu'il est doué de vie et que sa vie lui vient du dedans ". Cf. also DUPERRAY, *Le Christ dans la vie chrétienne d'après saint Paul*[2], p. 15 ff., SPACIL, art. *Christus caput corporis mystici ecclesiae* Bess. 1920, pp. 147-176, VOSTÉ, o. c., p. 37 ff., CATHALA, art. *La vie de l'église*, RT, 1912, pp. 743-762 ; 1913, pp. 1-16, 137-158, 655-677, D. COLUMBA MARMION, *Le Christ vie de l'âme*[16], (Paris, 1923), pp. 123-146, R. PLUS, *Dans le Christ Jésus* (Paris, 1923), pp. 1-57, TANQUEREY, *Précis de théologie ascétique et mystique* (Paris, 1923), 2 vols. *passim*, and especially vol. I, p. 98 ff., ST. THOMAS, *Sum. Theol.*, III, q. 8, MICHEL, art. *Jésus-Christ*, DTC, vol. VIII, col. 1349 ff., JOYCE, *The Catholic Doctrine of Grace*, p. 22 ff., LATTEY KEATING, *The Westminster Version of the New Testament*, vol. III, App. pp. 246-249, HEADLAM, *St. Paul and Christianity*, pp. 163 ff., W. H. GR. THOMAS, art. *The Doctrine of the Church in the Epistle to the Ephesians*, Exp., 1906, pp. 318-339.

The passages where Saint Paul speaks of the mystic body are very numerous, and are not easily coordinated. As in common parlance the term " body " is sometimes used to designate the whole human organism without excluding the head, so too the mystic body sometimes denotes a collectivity in which Christ and the Christians are barely distinguished : " For as the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of the body, whereas they are many, yet are one body, so also is Christ " (I Cor. XII, 11 ; cf. Rom. XI, 24 ; Gal. III, 16, 24-29). On the other hand, just as the word " body " is frequently taken in a more precise sense to designate the trunk and members as opposed to the head, so too the mystic body often becomes an articulated organism of which Christ is the Head and the Christians members; Christ and the Church become two integral parts of the same mystic body.

When the Apostle indicates more precisely the different parts of this mystic body and their relative place, it is clear that Christ represents the Head of the organism while the Church is designated by that part of the human body which we cali " trunk " :

" He is the *head* of the *body*, the *church* " (Col. I, 18).

" I now rejoice in my sufferings for you, and fill up those things that are wanting of the sufferings of Christ, is my flesh, for his *body*, which is the *church* " (Col. I, 24).

" You are filled in him, who is the *head* of all principality and power " (Col. II, 10).

" Not holding the *head*, from which the whole *body*, by joints and bands being supplied with nourishment and compacted, groweth unto the increase of God " (Col. II. 19).

" He hath subjected all things under his feet, and hath made him *head* over all the *church*, which is his *body* " (Eph. I, 22).

" Doing the truth in charity, we may in all things grow up in him who is the *head*, even *Christ*, from whom the whole *body*, being compacted and fifty joined together... maketh increase ", etc. (Eph. IV, 16).

" The husband is the head of the wife, as *Christ* is the *head* of the *church*. He is the saviour of his *body* " (Eph. V, 23).

" You are the *body* of Christ, and members of member... for in one Spirit were we all baptized into one *body* " (I Cor. XII, 27, 13).

" The *head* of every man is *Christ* " (I Cor. XI, 3).

" For we being many, are one bread, one *body*, all that partake of one bread " (the Eucharist) (I Cor. X, 17).

" We being many, are one *body* in Christ, and every one members one of another " (Rom. XII, 5).

Since the Apostle so frequently inculcates this comparison of the Church to the human body, it is evident that he does not wish to propose thereby a vague and indefinite similitude. On the contrary, he wishes to describe the intimate nature of the Church and express its real union with Christ. This is further confirmed by the fact that he deduces from that union consequences of the gravest import : " Know you not that your bodies are the members of Christ ? Shall I then take the members of Christ and make them the members of an harlot ? God forbid " (I Cor. VI, 15).

What, it may be asked, is the precise relation between the Head and the members ? The metaphor of the human head and body can be variously applied. In the human organism there is a connexion of cause and effect : all activity in the body comes from the head and through union with it ; there is a connexion of sympathy : head and body are one in feeling, whether of pain or of joy ; there is a connexion of obedience : the body responds to the orders of the head, and what the will commands the members execute. These same relations may be stated in other words : the head excels by its preeminence and perfection, it is the source of the vital powers in the members, and is so intimately united with the body that at times one can be substituted for the other and vice versa. Now in the Pauline Epistles all these qualities are verified in Christ, the Head of the Church.

The excellence and perfection of the Head is brought out in Col. I, 18-19 ; " He is the Head of the body, the church, who is the beginning, the first-born from the dead, that in all things he might hold the primacy, because in him, it hath well pleased the Father, that all fulness should dwell. " So too Christ is the Source of that vital influx whereby " we being many are one

body in Christ," and "in all things grow up in him who is the head, even Christ" (Rom. XII, 4; Eph. IV, 15). Finally, the very intimate union which exists between the Head and His mystic body is evident from Eph. I, 23 where the Church is called the "fulness of Christ," and especially from I Cor. XII, 12 where "Christ" and "Church" are interchangeable.

The Church is not merely an external and hierarchical society[1] but at the same time lives an ineffable internal life of the Spirit. For the superiority of Christ the Head consists precisely in the fact that in Him "dwells the fulness of *all* grace" (Col. I, 18, 19). So too the vital influence which the Head exercises on its members consists in the bestowal of the Spirit and of supernatural gifts; thus in Eph. IV, 11-16 the Apostle says: He Himself gave some as apostles, some as prophets, some as evangelists, some as pastors and teachers, with a view to the perfecting of the saints unto the work of ministering, unto the building up of the body of Christ, till we all (as a whole) attain to the oneness of the faith, and of the thorough knowledge of the Son of God, to a full-grown man, to the measure of the stature (or maturity) of the fulness of Christ; so that cherishing truth in love we may grow up unto Him in all things, Who is the Head, even Christ,

---

1. GRIFFITH THOMAS, art. *The Doctrine of the Church in the Epistle to the Ephesians*, Exp., 1906, p. 335, says that "we can readily see from the teaching of Ephesians that the primary idea of the Church is that of an organism rather than of an organization", and that "the Church in its true idea is a spiritual force rather than a visible institution". In regard to this remark we would note that while the analogies of the bride, of the building, and of the body do indeed express the vital influence, the intimate union, and mutual cohesion between Christ and the Church, they do not exclude a visible and hierarchical constitution of the Church; on the contrary they suppose it. For Saint Paul tells us that the diversity of graces in the Church has reference to the latter's government and institution (Eph. IV, 11-12). Besides, he clearly teaches and acknowledges a visible hierarchy of the Church (cf. I Tim. III, I Tim. V; Tit. I, 5, 7; Phil. I, 1). In Ephesus or Laodicea bishops were constituted to rule the church (Acts XIV, 22, XX, 29; Tit. I, 5). He acknowledged the authority of the "pillars" of the Church and of Peter (Gal. II). In the Acts Peter appears as holding a primacy of authority (I, 15, II. 14, 37, V, 3, 29, X, XV, 7). This authority Peter has from Christ (Mtt. XVI, 18-19). If in Ephesians references to the visible constitution of the Church are rare, this is due to the fact that the churches of Ephesus and of Laodicea were only recently founded, and that the Ephesian Epistle considers primarily the mystic union of the faithful with Christ and only indirectly the visible and hierarchical constitution of the Church. Again, many of the cities which Saint Paul had won for Christ were among the most turbulent of the Roman world. Hence if the Apostle has abandoned them to their own authority instead of governing them himself or through his delegate, there would have

from Whom the whole body (the Church) fitly framed and put together (συναρμολογούμενον καὶ συμβιβαζόμενον, v. 16), through every contact with the supply (διὰ πάσης ἁφῆς τῆς ἐπιχορηγίας) (from the Head), according to the proportionate working of each several part, carries on the growth of the body. A similar thought is found in Col. II, 16-19; the Apostle here tells the Colossians that the substance and reality is to be found only in the Gospel of Christ, and admonishes them not to suffer themselves to be robbed of it by any stratagem of the false teachers. For the latter have substituted inferior spiritual agencies for the one true mediator, the Eternal Word. Clinging to these lower intelligences, they have lost their hold of the Head. They have severed their connection with Him on Whom the whole body depends, from Whom it derives its vitality, and to Whom its owes its unity, being supplied with nourishment and knit together in one (ἐπιχορηγούμενον καὶ συνβιβαζόμενον, v. 19) by means of the several junctures and ligaments (διὰ τῶν ἁφῶν καὶ συνδέσμων [1]), so that it grows with a growth which comes from God. Finally, when the Apostle calls the Church the complement of Christ (Eph. I, 23, τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν πληρουμένου), it is again the supernatural life, which

---

been the danger of their being dissolved by internal strife, after the manner of the democratic assemblies of that time. Moreover, national sentiment, which had contributed so powerfully to unite the Judeo-Christian communities, was lacking among the Gentile churches, where civic pride centered in the city alone. Hence there was always danger of isolation and of schism.

1. The ἁφαί are the joinings, the junctures. When applied to the human body they could be called " joints ", provided that we use the word accurately of the relations between contiguous limbs, and not loosely of the parts of the limbs themselves in the neighborhood of the contact. The συνδέσμοι denote any of the connecting bands which strap the body together, such as muscles or tendons or ligaments properly so-called. The two functions performed by the ἁφαί and συνδεσμοι are, first, the supply of nutriment (ἐπιχορηγούμενον), and, secondly, the compacting of the frame (συνβιβαζόμενον), i. e., they are the communication of life and energy, and the preservation of unity and order. The source of all (ἐξ οὗ, Col. II, 19) is Christ Himself, the Head; but the channels of communication (διὰ τῶν κ. τ. λ.) are the different members of His body, in their relation one to another. The image contained in συνβιβαζόμενον is more distinctly emphasized in Eph. IV, 16: συναρμολογούμενον καὶ συνβιβαζόμενον. The difference corresponds to the different aim of the two Epistles: in the Colossian letter the vital connection with the Head is the main theme, in the Ephesian, the unity in diversity among the members. By the twofold means of contact and attachment nutriment has been diffused and structural unity has been attained, but these are not the ultimate result. They are only intermediate processes; the end is *growth*.

Christ's community derives from its Head and which reaches the members only through the body, that he wishes primarily to indicate. This gift of the Spirit, which is the principle of life and unity in the whole mystic body, was bestowed on the faithful when through baptism they were incorporated into Christ: " In one Spirit we were all baptized into one body " (I Cor. XIII, 13; cf. Eph. IV, 5).

From the above it is evident that the mystic body is not a mere metaphor or a simple moral entity, but a composite of the supernatural order, receiving a vital influx from the Head. From this teaching the doctrine of the communion of saints, which is the bond of life *solidaire*, uniting the members of Christ with one another and with their Head, under the common action of the same Spirit, follows as a necessary corollary. Every Christian works and contributes to the full development of the body of Christ. The Person of Our Lord, it is of course true, possesses a plenitude to which nothing can be added. But the mystic Christ is susceptible of indefinite increase which it receives with the growth of its individual members. Thus the Church gradually " groweth up into an holy temple in the Lord " (Eph. II, 21), acquires a full stature, and becomes a " perfect man " (Eph. IV, 13). All the members of the mystic body live of Christ's Life, receive His influence, and should aid one another, for " if one member suffer anything, all the members suffer with it, or if any member glory, all the members rejoice with it " (I Cor. XII, 26). No part gains anything which does not profit the whole, nor does the whole acquire anything which is not profitable to the parts.

The fruits produced by this as it were vital circuit are distributed to the different members principally by means of prayer. Saint Paul has so great a confidence in the exchange of spiritual graces that he can write: " Take unto you the helmet of salvation, and the sword of the Spirit (which is the word of God). By all prayer and supplication praying at all times in the spirit; and in the same watching with all instance and supplication for all the saints, and for me, that speech may be given me, that I may open my mouth with confidence, to make known the mystery of the Gospel " (Eph. VI, 17-19; cf. I, 16 ff.). And to the Romans he writes: " I beseech you, brethren, through our Lord Jesus Christ, and by the charity of the Holy Ghost, that you help me in your prayers for me to God, that I

may be delivered from the unbelievers that are in Judea " (Rom. xv, 30, 31 ; cf. II Cor. i, 11). The prayers of the just are not only useful to the living but also profitable to the dead : the Apostle not only recommends to Timothy the family of Onesiphorus, but also commends to God the soul of the deceased : " The Lord grant unto him to find mercy of the Lord in that day " (II Tim. i, 18).

Saint Paul tells the Colossians that the tribulations and afflictions which he himself endured in the course of his mission to the Gentiles were ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν and ὑπὲρ τοῦ σῶματος αὐτοῦ : νῦν χαίρω ἐν τοῖς παθήμασιν ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν καὶ ἀνταναπλήρω τὰ ὑστερήματα τῶν θλίψεων τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐν τῇ σαρκί μου ὑπὲρ τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ, ὅ ἐστιν ἡ ἐκκλησία (Col. i, 14). This passage, which is often quoted in connection with Saint Paul's doctrine concerning the mystic body, raises no small difficulties. In the first place, what are the θλίψεις of which the Apostle speaks here ? Are they " the afflictions imposed by Christ, " or " the afflictions endured for Christ's sake, " or " the afflictions which resemble those of Christ ? " All these explanations put a more or less forced meaning on the genitive, and ignore the meaning of ἀντὶ in ἀνταναπληρῶ which points to a distinction of persons suffering. Others understand the θλίψεις as Saint Paul's own afflictions regarded as Christ's, because Christ suffers in the members of His Church ; this interpretation is in itself no doubt true and harmonizes with what Saint Paul says elsewhere, but, like the others, it empties the first preposition in ἀνταναπληρῶ of any meaning; the preposition ἀντὶ in the compound denotes the fact that the supply comes from an opposite quarter to the deficiency [1].

---

1. For the usage of the term ἀνταναπληροῦν cf.
DEMOSTH., *de Symm.*, p. 182, τούτων τῶν συμμοριῶν ἑκάστην διελεῖν κελεύω πέντε μέρη κατὰ δώδεκα ἀνδρας, ανταναπληροῦντας πρὸς τὸν εὐπορώτατον ἀεὶ τοὺς ἀπορωτάτους.
CLEM. ALEX. *Strom.* VII, 12, p. 878, οὗτος... τὴν αποστολικὴν ἀπουσίαν ἀνταναπληροῖ.
APOLLON. *Constr. Or.* I, 3 (p. 13 ff.), ἡ αντωνυμία ἀνταναπληροῦσα καὶ τὴν θέσιν τοῦ ὀνάματος καὶ τὴν τάξιν τοῦ ῥήματος.
PTOL. *Math. Comp.* VI, 9, ἐπεὶ δ' ἡ μὲν ἐλλείπειν ἐποίει τὴν ἀποκατάστασιν ἡ δὲ πλεονάζειν κατά τινα συντυχίαν ἣν ἴσως καὶ ὁ Ἵππαρχος ἀνταναπληρουμένην πως κατανενοήκει κ. τ. λ.
Cf. also DIOG. LAERT, X, 48, XEN. *Hell.* II, 4, 11, 12. THEMIST. *Paraphr. Arist.* 43 B, JOSEPH. *Ant.* XVIII, 9, 7. For these references cf. LIGHTFOOT, *Colossians and Philemon*[5], pp. 164-166.

The only natural explanation of the words, τῶν θλίψεων τοῦ Χριστοῦ, is that they are the afflictions which Christ Himself endured. But how in this sense can we speak of Christ's sufferings as being incomplete, or as needing to be supplemented ? For the Passion of Christ was a perfect and sufficient sacrifice, oblation and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world. In this sense there can be no ὑστερήμα of Christ's sufferings, for these being different in kind from those of His servants, the two are incommensurable. It is more probable that the θλίψεις τοῦ Χριστοῦ are the labors and tribulations of Christ's public preaching and ministry (cf. John IV, 6 ; Mk. XI, 12 ; Mtt. VIII, 20 ; cf. II Cor. I, 6, 8). These were in a certain sense incomplete since Christ preached for only a limited period of time and in only a limited part of the earth. They were to be supplemented by the Apostles and their successors who through the ages would " preach the gospel to every creature. " Understood in this sense the term θλίψις implies no opprobrium for Christ Who Himself said that He was not sent " but to the sheep that are lost of the house of Israel " (Mtt. XV, 23), and Who commanded His Apostles to " go into the whole world and preach the gospel to every creature " (Mtt. XXVIII, 19; Mk. XVI, 15). The sufferings which Saint Paul endured in executing this mandate went towards [1] filling up the ὑστερήματα; these will be fully supplemented, however, only when the Church's struggle with sin and unbelief is ended. How many tribulations in the flesh Saint Paul, the διάκονος τοῦ εὐαγγελίου (Col. I, 23 ; cf. I, 21-23) and Χριστοῦ (II Cor. XI, 23), endured in announcing the gospel to the Gentiles (comp. Col. I, 23 : τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, τοῦ κηρυχθέντος ἐν πάσῃ κτίσει, and Mk. XVI, 15 : κηρύξατε τὸ εὐαγγέλιον πάσῃ τῇ κτίσει), and especially in imparting to them the " mystery " which had been hidden in former ages (Col. I, 25-29 ; cf. Eph. III, I, VI, 19-20 ; Col. IV, 3), is evident from the enumeration in II Cor. XI, 23-27 [2]. Ant these sufferings Saint Paul is said to have undergone for the Colossians (ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν) and for the Church (ὑπὲρ τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ). Hence the doctrine of the communion of saints is again indicated in this verse (cf. I Cor. XII, 26).

1. The present tense, ἀνταναπληρῶ, as LIGHTFOOT, o. c., p. 166, remarks, denotes an inchoate and not a complete act.

2. Cf. KNABENBAUER, *Epistolae ad Ephesios, Philippenses et Colossenses*, pp. 309-312.

The metaphors which we have briefly described above, and which are the expressions of our incorporation into Christ and of our participation in His Spirit, likewise clearly indicate the Church's characteristics. For as a temple of God, the Church has the Apostles for foundation, as the Bride of Jesus Christ, it is holy, as the mystic body it is one, and as a society of the Christian faithful, it is catholic or universal.

Art. II. — NOTES OF THE CHURCH.

That the Church is *apostolic* the Apostle clearly affirms when he writes that it was " built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets (θεμελίῳ τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ προφητῶν) Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone (ὄντος ἀκρογωνιαίου) (Eph. II, 20). " Foundation " here does not designate the foundation on which the Apostles are built, or which they built, or on which they built, but the Apostles themselves are the foundation of the Church [1].

That the Church is *holy* is supposed throughout the Pauline Epistles. For the Christians, by the very fact that they are baptized, and belong to the mystic body, are by their vocation called to be saints and consecrated to God. " When we were dead in sins, " says Saint Paul, " God hath quickened us together in Christ, hath raised us up, and hath made us sit together

1. The genitive in Eph. II, 20, θεμελίῳ τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ προφητῶν, has been understood in four different ways : a) *genitive of possession :* " the foundation on which the apostles and prophets have built ". But this interpretation confuses θεμέλιος and ἀκρογων ; Christ is spoken of as the corner-stone, not as the foundation. b) " The foundation on which they themselves have been built ". The same objection applies to this view as to the first. c) *Genitive auctoris :* " the foundation they laid ". But against this view several objections at once arise : first, nowhere is the gospel or any doctrine called the foundation of the Church. Secondly, it would be incongruous to assume as the corner-stone, Christ's Person, and as foundation, the system of teaching about Christ. Thirdly, the building consists of persons ; the figure in I Cor. III, 10 is different ; the building there is of doctrine, and the foundation is naturally doctrinal. Finally, the important point in the passage is that both Gentiles and Jews were members of one and the same theocracy, were stones in the same building as the ἅγιοί. d) *Genitive of apposition :* " the foundation which consists of the apostles and prophets ". This is the preferable view (cf. Apoc. XX, 14). The objection that in this interpretation Christ is named as the *primus inter pares* does not seem to be of much force, for among the Orientals the corner-stone was reckoned of greater importance than the foundation, and as connecting and concentrating on itself the weight of the building.

in the heavenly places through Christ Jesus... For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus in good works, which God hath prepared that we should walk in them " (Eph. II, 5-10). We must therefore put off the old man, and put on the new, who according to God is created in justice and holiness of truth (Eph. IV, 22-24). Interior perfection is the sign of the new converts and that which ought to separate them from the rest of the world. To be called to form a part of the Church and to be associated with it is to be called apart from humanity towards an ideal which the greater part of the world ignores, and to desire to live in an altogether different spirit and purpose (I Cor. I, 26, II, 6, 8). To deviate from this line of conduct is *eo ipso*, without there being need of a judgment on the part of the Apostle or of the head of the community, to place oneself in the necessity of going out of the Christian assembly (I Cor. V, 7). This moral perfection places the new converts so much above the rest of men that their affairs ought to be treated among themselves and not to be carried outside of the community (I Cor. VI). Hence also the appellation " saints " or " church of saints " by which the Apostle often salutes his community, expressions, which contain principally the idea of " consecrated " or " separated ". The underlying idea in these titles is the fact that the Christians are a very particular society called to pursue an ideal of perfection, and consecrated, by the very fact of their vocation, to God and to the risen Christ. It was in order that the Church might have this holiness that Christ gave himself for us, an oblation and a sacrifice to God : " Christ loved the church, and delivered himself up for it, that he might sanctify it, cleansing it by the laver of water in the word of life, that he might present it to himself a glorious church, not having spot or wrinkle, or any such thing, but that it should be holy, and without blemish " (Eph. V, 26-27) [1].

1. WATSON, art. *The Holy Catholic Church*, Exp., 1900, p. 352, asks : " What is the explanation of this paradox, that St. Paul should begin his letter to the Corinthians with the word Saints, and a little later should be using the word fornication? " And he answers that the explanation is to be sought in the magnificent convictions of Saint Paul which were not " confined by the things which are seen and temporal, but lived among the things which are unseen and eternal. Two worlds were his, this imperfect and corrupt world, which is passing away, and the perfect and holy world which remaineth "..... " The life which Christ was living in the heavenly places was the life His disciples were living in idea, and would one time live in reality ; and, therefore, when St. Paul addressed the Church, he thought of it as spiritual, the body

The *unity* of the Church is represented by Saint Paul as being intended, contemplated, and provided for, in the atoning Death of Christ : " You were at that time without Christ, being aliens from the conversation of Israel,and strangers to the testament having no hope of the promise and without God in this world. But now in Christ Jesus, you, who some time were afar off, are made nigh by the blood of Christ. For he is our peace, who hath made both one, and breaking down the middle wall of partition, the enmities in his flesh, making void the law of commandments, contained in decrees, that he might make the two in himself into one new man, making peace, and might reconcile both to God in one body by the cross, killing the enmities in himself. And coming he preached peace to you that were afar off, and peace to them that were nigh. For by him we have access both in one Spirit to the Father " (Eph. II, 12-18). The fact that there was to be one Body, consisting of Jews and Gentiles, was the special revelation made to Saint Paul, and the magnificent theme of the Epistles of the Captivity : " The mystery of Christ which in other generations was not known to the sons of men is now revealed to his holy apostles and prophets in the Spirit, that the Gentiles should be fellow heirs, and of the *same body*, and co-partners of his promise in Christ Jesus by the Gospel " (note συν: συνκληρονόμα, καὶ σύνσωμα καὶ συνμέτοχα, Eph. III, 4-6) ; " There is neither Gentile nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, Barbarian nor Scythian, bond nor free. But Christ is all and in all " (Col. III, 11); " There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female. For you are all one in Christ Jesus (Gal. III ,28). The Jews and Gentiles were therefore to be " joint-partakers " and " joint-heirs " in the one mystic body of Christ.

Our common incorporation into Christ then is the great

---

of the Lord crucified, dead, risen, holy, the congregation of all the saints. This is the Church Invisible, because in its ideal beauty it can only be seen by faith — by those who can see it in the Lord " (p. 353). The Visible Church are those whom " he must rebuke and teach and guard and endure, if haply, through his work and the grace of God, the real may be purified and elevated till it passes at last into the ideal, and even the Corinthian Church be presented as a pure Virgin unto Christ..... the Church Invisible is at once the condemnation and the inspiration of the Church Visible " (p. 353).

principle of unity. To one Head belongs one body, and as there is only one natural Christ it is impossible that there be more than one mystic Christ. " Be careful, " says the Apostle, " to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. One body and one Spirit, as you are called in one hope of your calling. One Lord, one faith, one baptism. One God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in us all " (Eph. IV, 3-6). Here we have three intrinsic, three extrinsic, and one transcendent principles of unity. The Church is one, first of all, because a common inward life, the *Spirit*, from a common source, Christ, flows in her veins; because they all share one common supernatural life, the imparted life of the Spirit, the Christians are to make it their deliberate object to preserve this actual spiritual unity in its appropriate outward expression, that is, in harmonious fellowship. Again, though different individual members go up to make the Church they are nevertheless all bound into one *body* under Christ as Head, because the one Spirit which is Christ's supreme gift is imparted to the whole organization and every member of it. This common corporate life where the elements are so different is made possible by the one *hope* reaching forward into an eternal world which was set before them when they were baptized; this should also be sufficient to remove all selfish and short-lived differences. Again, the Church is one because the existence of a common Head involves a common obedience and allegiance to Him as *Lord*, one by the common *faith* which serves as its rule and exterior norm, one by its efficient cause, *baptism*, whereby our allegiance to Christ is cemented by an actual incorporation into His Life and becomes thereby much more than a mere outward fealty. Finally, all humanity is destined henceforth to form one family in the house of a common *Father*. At this point the unity of the Church merges itself into unicity or catholicity.

As soon as it is established that God extends to all men His redemptive designs, that He does not wish to save them save by incorporating them into Christ, it follows that the Church is not only one in its essence but also *universal* in its destination. As the Bride of Christ, the Church virtually embraces all the human race. As the body of Christ, it is the means in which are to be reborn all those who were dead in Adam. As the true Israel and kingdom of God, it bursts asunder the particularism of the ancient theocracy. This universality or catholicity

of the Church the prophets announced and the apostles are charged to realize by preaching the Gospel to the ends of the earth. Jewish exclusivism had ended, the regime of privilege had ceased, the ancient theocracy had had its day. " Is God the God of the Jews only ? Is he not also of the Gentiles ? Yes of the Gentiles also " (Rom. III, 29 ; cf. X, 12). The Gentiles who were formerly strangers to the alliance and to the promises, who were without God or without Christ, who were despised and without hope, are now united into one people with the chosen race ; they are the *concives sanctorum et domestici Dei*, and not mere sojourners. Henceforth, the entire world shall form only one kingdom, one city, one house, with Christ as its Head.

The Church as catholic removes all that is opposed to unity and universality. For it suppresses, from the religious point of view, all differences, whether national, social, or individual, eliminates all inequalities of rights and privileges, and infuses into all its members the common life of the Spirit (cf. Gal. III, 26-28 ; Col. III, 11). The quality of sons of God has effaced all differences and distinctions of race, education, social rank, and even of sex. In this new economy even the Scythian, the most barbarous of peoples, shall have his legitimate place. That this catholicity of a human brotherhood involved many difficulties for the Apostle no one can doubt. " After all, the degree of unity impressed by the Roman Empire upon the different nations it embraced was superficial. On the whole it left men to walk in their own ways. In particular it did not succeed in breaking down the barriers of Jewish isolation. A society in which men should be neither Jews nor Gentiles, Greeks nor barbarians, bond nor free, but all should be welded into one manhood by the pressure of a common and constraining bond of brotherhood — a society in which even the savage and brutal Scythian should have equal fellowship with Greeks and Jews — represented what had never yet been accomplished, and what the most sanguine might reasonably have thought impossible " [1].

The Jewish theocracy, as we know, was national in its char-

1. GORE, *St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians*, pp. 123-124 ; the same author continues on p. 126 : " We cannot but pause and ask, in view of all the moral discipline for men of various kinds which St. Paul sees to be involved in the

acter, and in no way aspired to be a religion of the world ; to become international would be to lose the position of a privileged institution. It could indeed receive new members but only on the condition of maintaining them in a humiliating inferiority and imposing on them certain conditions which would clearly prevent the race from becoming one religious family. This wall of separation, the Mosaic Law, was the first barrier which was removed by the Redeemer ; by nailing to the Cross the old handwriting which by its multiple ordinances was against us, He opened wide the gates of the new economy to nations which till then were separated from it (Eph. II, 14-19). All are henceforth reconciled among themselves and with God, and are united to Christ in the one sole mystic body.

This spectacle of a catholic brotherhood, with all that it promised of universal unity beyond itself, this marvellous climax of the workings and revelations of God, filled the Apostle with great joy. This, and nothing less than this, was the divine " mystery " which, held back from all eternity in the mind of God, was only now being disclosed through Christ's messengers, and especially through Saint Paul himself, the Apostle of the Gentiles. This secret design of God, which the prophets of old had barely suspected, and whose depths the angels had not penetrated, is the Gospel of which Saint Paul is the herald, it is his own Gospel, it is the Gospel for which he suffers and is in chains (Eph. III, 1 ; VI, 19-20 ; Col. IV, 3). That henceforth the Gentiles are " co-partners " and " joint-heirs " of the kingdom of God, that, like the Jews, they enter it with full equality of rights and privileges, that they are members of the mystic body of Christ on the same title as the others, that they have part in the promises made to the prophets, that the blessings destined for the posterity of the patriarchs concern them as well as the Jews to whom exclusively they seemed to be addressed, — these are the joyful contents of this Gospel, this is the " mystery, " which made *tabula rasa* of the ancient privileges and pretentions of Israel, which roused against the Apostle the passions of the Judaizers, and which brought persecutions,

---

simple obligation to belong to one Christian body (Eph. IV, 1-3), — what would have been his feelings if he had heard of the doctrine which cuts at the root of all this discipline by declaring that religion is only concerned with the relation of the soul to God, and that Christians may combine as they please in as many religious bodies as suits their varying tastes ? "

captivity, and even posthumous calumnies for the great defender and champion of the Gentiles.

This redemptive plan or, more exactly, this eternal decree in virtue of which the Gentiles are received into the Church on a footing of perfect equality with the Jews, is already alluded so in the early Epistles. Thus in Rom. XVI, 25-27 the Apostle tays : " to him that is able to establish you, according to my gospel, and the preaching of Jesus Christ, according to the revelation of the mystery, which was kept secret from all eternity, (which now is made manifest by the scriptures of the prophets, according to the precept of the eternal God, for the obedience of faith), known among all nations : to God the only wise, through Jesus Christ, to whom be honor and glory for ever and ever. " Similarly in I Cor. II, 7-10 Saint Paul says : " we speak the wisdom of God in a mystery, a wisdom which is hidden, which God ordained before the world, unto our glory, which none of the princes of this world knew ; for if they had known it, they would never have crucified the Lord of glory, but as it is written that eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither hath it entered into the heart of man, what things God hath prepared for them that love him. "

It is, however, only in his Epistles of the Captivity that the Apostle defines the " mystery " with more clearness and precision. Thus the long parenthesis which fills almost the whole third chapter of Ephesians had no other object : " For this cause, I Paul, the prisoner of Jesus Christ, for you Gentiles ; if yet you have heard of the dispensation of the grace of God which is given me towards you : how that, according to revelation, the mystery has been known to me, as I have written above in a few words : as you reading, may understand my knowledge in the mystery of Christ, which in other generations was not known to the sons of man, as it is now revealed to his holy apostles and prophets in the Spirit: that the Gentiles should be fellow heirs, and of the same body, and co-partners of his promise in Christ Jesus... to me, the least of all the saints, is given this grace, to preach among the Gentiles, the unsearchable riches of Christ, and to enlighten all men, that they may see what is the dispensation of the mystery which hath been hidden from eternity in God who created all things : that the manifold wisdom of God may be made known to the principalities and powers in heavenly places through the Church, according to the

eternal purpose, which he made, in Christ Jesus our Lord " (III, 1-11). The " mystery " receives further precision in Col. II, 24-27 where the Apostle says that Christ is the hope, the property, and the riches of the Gentiles who formerly were strangers to the Messianic promises and blessings. Finally, Saint Paul tells us that the object of the " secret " is the redeeming mission of Christ, which consists in this that all creation should be united to Him as to its Chief and Head : " God made known to us the mystery of his will, according to his good pleasure, which he hath purposed in him, in the dispensation of the fulness of times, to reestablish all things in Christ, that are in heaven and on earth, in him " (Eph. I, 9-10).

We may here briefly summarize the results which we have so far attained. We have seen above what are the means of appropriating the atoning effects of the Redemption. By baptism, of which faith is a necessary prelude and preparation, we are incorporated into Christ and participate of His Spirit. It is the Spirit which is the cohesive-bond of Church fellowship, the bond of union of believers with Christ and with one another in the Christian Church. Thus the role of the Spirit and that of the glorified Christ are, as it were, identical in the work of sanctification. In fact Saint Paul attributes adoptive filiation, grace, salvation, eternal glory, etc., now to Christ and now to the Spirit. Thus God " predestinated us unto the adoption of children through Jesus Christ " (Eph. I, 5), and yet " whosoever are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God " (Rom. VIII, 14). Again, " we live in the Spirit " (Gal. V, 25), and yet " Christ is our life " (Phil. I, 21). " Resurrection of the dead is by a man, " Jesus Christ (I Cor. XV, 21), nevertheless, " God shall quicken our mortal bodies, because of his Spirit that dwelleth in you " (Rom. VIII, 11) [1] But while there is here an

1. We might here note the equivalence of the formulas " in Christ " and " in the Spirit " ; cf. :

Gal. II, 17 : ζητοῦντες δικαιωθῆναι ἐν Χριστῷ, and I Cor. VI, 11 : ἐδικαιώθητε... ἐν πνεύματι τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν.

I Cor. I, 2 : ἡγιασμένοις ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, and Rom. XV, 16 (cf. I Cor. VI, 11) ἡγιασμένη ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ.

Eph. IV, 17 : μαρτύρομαι ἐν κυρίῳ, and Rom. IX, 1 : συμμαρτυρούσης μοι τῆς συνειδήσεώς μου ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ.

Col. II, 10 : καὶ ἐστὲ ἐν αὐτῷ πεπληρωμένοι, and Eph. V, 18 : πληροῦσθε ἐν πνεύματι.

identity of operations there is no confusion of persons. The points of contact between Christ and the Spirit concern solely the glorified Christ, not in His physical and personal life on the right hand of the Father but in His mystic life in the bosom of the Church ; in our supernatural life we live by the Son and we live by the Spirit, or more precisely, we live by the Holy Spirit sent by the Son. By participating of Christ's Spirit the Christian ceases to be a slave of Sin and Satan, becomes an adopted son, is regenerated and justified, and henceforth produces the fruits of the Holy Ghost[1].

Rom. XII, 5 : οἱ πολλοὶ ἕν ἐν σῶμά ἐσμεν Χριστῷ, and I Cor. XII, 13 : ἐν ἑνὶ πνεύματι ἡμεῖς πάντες εἰς ἓν σῶμα ἐβαπτίσθημεν.

Eph. II, 21 : ναὸς ἅγιος ἐν κυρίῳ, and Eph. II, 22 : κατοικητήριον τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν πνεύματι.

Eph. I, 13 : ἐν ᾧ (Χρ.) καὶ πιστεύσαντες ἐσφραγίσθητε, and Eph. IV, 30 : τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν ᾧ ἐσφραγίσθητε.

Phil. IV, 4 : χαίρετε ἐν κυρίῳ, and Rom. XIV, 17: χαρὰ ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ.

Phil. IV, 7 : ἡ εἰρήνη τοῦ θεοῦ φρουρήσει ἐν Χρ. Ἰ., and Rom. XIV, 17 : εἰρήνη καὶ χαρὰ ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ. Cf. DEISSMANN, *Die neutestamentliche Formel " in Christo Jesu "*, p. 84 ff. The equivalence of the above formulas however does not go so far as is at times supposed ; certainly one cannot conclude therefrom the personal identity of the Holy Ghost and of Christ. LEBRETON, *Les origines du dogme de la Trinité*[3], p. 328 says : " Ce qu'on a le droit d'en conclure, c'est que le Christ n'agit dans l'âme, et ne s'unit à elle que par l'Esprit Saint.... Jésus n'est pas seulement pour saint Paul l'ami qu'il désire rejoindre ni l'idéal qu'il veut imiter ; il est pour lui, pour tous les chrétiens, le principe de la vie, le chef dont ils sont les membres ; mais cette union, cette influence sont purement métaphoriques, si l'on ne tient pas compte de l'Esprit départi par le Christ aux chrétiens ". Moreover, the interchange of ἐν Χριστῷ and ἐν πνεύματι is impossible where there is question of God predestinating, choosing, and loving us " in Christ " (Rom. VIII, 39 ; II Cor. V, 19 ; Eph. I, 3), where there is question of Christ as Second Adam, i. e. of His redemptive mission (Rom. III, 24 ; I Cor. XV, 22 ; Eph. II, 13, IV, 32 ; II Tim. II, 10) and where ἐν Χριστῷ is equivalent to " from the Christian view-point " (Rom. XVI, 3, 9, 10 ; I Cor. III, 1, etc.). Even where the substitution is absolutely possible it eliminates a certain delicate shade of meaning, such as would be produced if the soul is put in the place of the head or vice versa Cf. HEADLAM, *St. Paul and Christianity*[2], p. 143 ff.

1. Cf. LEBRETON, *Les origines du dogme de la Trinité*[3], p. 337 ff.

CHAPTER III.

The Era of the Spirit [1].

The moment at which the new life of the Christian began is identified with the convert's admission into the Church by baptism. In baptism the " old man, " i. e., the former unregenerate self, was crucified together with Christ, in order that a new self might take its place. It was the Christian's second birth, his renovation by the Spirit of Christ. " We are saved, " says the Apostle, " by the laver of regeneration and renovation of the Holy Ghost, whom he hath poured forth upon us abundantly, through Jesus Christ, our Saviour, that, being justified by his grace, we may be heirs, according to hope of life everlasting " (Tit. III, 5-7). The baptized man may by his subsequent conduct grieve the Holy Ghost (Eph. IV, 30), and even extinguish the Divine fire in his heart (I Thess. V, 19), but from that moment he can never be again in the position of one to whom the Spirit had not been given. From that moment, with that great sacramental act, the life of the Spirit began. Henceforth the Spirit is the divine guest of each one of the faithful and of the Church. He is the soul of the mystic body, which He ennobles by His presence, vivifies by His contact, and animates by His activity.

The Holy Ghost dwells in the individual Christian and in

---

1. The Apostle usually describes the Spirit by personal terms. The Spirit " dwells " within, " leads ", " witnesses along with " the human spirit, intercedes for men over against God (I Cor. III, 16, Rom. VIII, 9, 14, 16, 26). He " searches " and " knows " the Divine Mind, " works ", " distributes ". " wills " and can be " grieved " (I Cor. II, 10, XII, 11 ; Eph. IV, 30). Such attributes as thought, choice, selection, volition, identity of subject amid manifold operations (I Cor. XII, 4-9), suggest a personal and self-conscious agent. That this personification is not merely poetic, as some Protestants claim, is evident not only from the supernatural quality of His working but also from the frequent coordination of the Spirit with the Father and the Son (Rom. VIII, 9-11 ; I Cor. XII, 4-11 ; II Cor. XIII, 14 ; Eph. II, 18, IV, 4-6). He is described as the " Spirit that is of God " τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ (I Cor. II, 12), and as the " Spirit of His Son ", τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ (Gal. IV, 6). Cf. LEBRETON, o. c., p. 325 ff., DOWNER, *Mission and Ministration of the Spirit*, pp. 1-37, HEADLAM, *St. Paul and Christianity*[2], p. 95 ff.

the entire Church as in His own temple. "Know you not," says the Apostle, "that you are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you? But if any man violate the temple of God, him shall God destroy. For the temple of God is holy which you are" (I Cor. III, 16, 17; cf. Rom. VIII, 9; II Tim. I, 14). Our body, too, is a temple of the Holy Ghost who dwells in us: "Know you not that your members are the temple of the Holy Ghost who is in you, whom you have from God, and you are not your own" (I Cor. VI, 19)[1]? "If the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead, dwell in you; he that raised up Jesus Christ from the dead, shall quicken also your mortal bodies, because of his Spirit that dwelleth in you" (Rom. VIII, 11). "You are the temple of the living God," (II Cor. VI, 16), "you are built together into an habitation of God in the Spirit" (Eph. II, 22). And when did this consecration of the Christians into a holy temple of the Spirit take place? This great change in the moral condition of the converts from heathenism took place in baptism; after enumerating ten of the worst vices practised in the most immoral city of Greece, Saint Paul continues: "And such some of you were; but you are washed, but you are sanctified, but you are justified in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the Spirit of our God" (I Cor. VI, 11). In the same baptismal incorporation of the believer into Christ the Apostle also finds a sufficient dissuasive from the common Greek sin of fornication. For, as Genesis teaches, the union of man and woman makes them one body,

1. SWETE, *The Holy Spirit in the New Testament*[2], pp. 180-181: "As in the Greek temples at Corinth, the temple of Aphrodite on the Acropolis, the temple of Poseidon on the Isthmus, the innermost shrine was occupied by the image that represented the deity; as at Jerusalem the Holy of Holies, though it contained no image of God, was for Israel the Divine dwelling-place on earth; so the Christian congregation in every place where the Church had been planted, and even the body of the individual believer, had become a holy place, a sanctuary of the Divine Spirit which dwells in the Ecclesia collectively and in its members as individuals. Both collectively and individually believers are in virtue of their baptism consecrated shrines of the presence of God, and in both capacities it is laid upon them to guard the sanctity of the Divine abode. The heathen deities did not require from their worshippers any jealous watch against the intrusion of immorality; on the contrary, as the Corinthians knew, the great temple on the Acro-corinthus was a vast home of licensed vice. But the Spirit which dwells in the Church is essentially holy, and the sanctuary of the Holy Spirit must be holy not only by a sacramental consecration but through the maintenance of the strictest purity".

one being ; but where such union of body and personality is inspired by a degrading passion for a harlot, it is an intolerable profanation and desecration of the body which already belongs to and is united with Christ (I Cor. VI, 15) [1].

The passages, in which the life of the Spirit is described as manifesting itself outwardly in what may be called " fruit, " are very numerous, and we can only glance at them here in a rapid survey. The " fruit " of the Spirit is freedom from the " law of sin and of death " which had hitherto crippled and bound us (Rom. VIII, 2). It is a walking after and under the continued guidance and control of the Holy Spirit (Rom. VIII, 4 ; cf. Gal. V, 16). It is to be in the " mind of the Spirit " which means " life and peace " (Rom. VIII, 6). It is life in justification, and a mortifying of the body and of its deeds (Rom.VIII, 13, 10). The Spirit is the " pledge " of our immortality (Rom. VIII, 11, 15-17 ; 23 ; cf. II Cor. I, 22, V, 5 ; Eph. I, 14 ; IV, 30). He is the Intercessor in our needs (Rom. VIII, 26). If the members of Christ's body are distinguished by a joyous spirit which triumphs over circumstances however adverse, it is because the Kingdom of God which Christ came to establish upon earth is " justice, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost " (Rom. XIV, 17). If they " abound in hope " it is " in the power of the Holy Ghost " (Rom. XV, 13). If the Apostle would appeal to the sympathy of men, most of whom were personally unknown to him, it is " by the charity of the Holy Ghost " (Rom. XV, 30). To the Spirit, in fact, was due the conversion of the Gentiles ; the Apostle knows that his offering could not have been acceptable unless it had been " sanctified in the Holy Ghost " (Rom. XV, 16). All that the great Apostle had accomplished was wrought by Christ through his hands " in the power of the Holy Ghost " (Rom. XV, 19 ; cf. I Thess. I, 5, 6 ; I Cor. II, 4, III, 40).

The Holy Spirit is the author of the *charismata*, supernatural and gratuitous gifts, which manifest the Spirit's activity in the Church by enabling some of the faithful to perform different actions, principally for the good of the whole Church : " There are diversities of graces, but the same Spirit, and there are diversities of ministries, but the same Lord, and there are diversities of operations, but the same God who worketh all in all. And

1. Cf. WALKER, *Why God Became Man*, pp. 148-167.

the manifestation of the Spirit is given to every man unto profit. To one indeed, by the Spirit, is given the word of wisdom, and to another the word of knowledge, according to the same Spirit. To another faith in the same Spirit, to another the grace of healing in one Spirit. To another the working of miracles; to another prophecy ; to another the discerning of spirits ; to another diverse kinds of tongues ; to another interpretation of speeches. But all these things one and the same Spirit worketh, dividing to every one according as he will " (I Cor. XII, 4-11 ; cf. Rom. XII, 6-8 ; Eph. IV, 11) [1]. In Second Corinthians the Apostle tells his converts that they are " the epistle of Christ, written not with ink, but with the Spirit of the living God " (III, 3), and that " where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty " (III, 17).

Again, the " fruit " of the Spirit is the child's cry: Abba, Father (Gal. IV, 6; cf. Rom. VIII, 14-17). It is life in the Spirit Himself: " If we live in the Spirit, let us also walk in the Spirit " (Gal. V, 25). It is a strong desire, ἐπιθυμία, after all good and against the lusts of the flesh (Gal. V, 17). It is " charity joy, peace, patience, benignity, goodness, longanimity, mildness, faith, modesty, continency, chastity " (Gal. V, 22, 23).

Furthermore, " in one Spirit we have access to the Father " (Eph. II, 18). By God's Spirit we are strengthened " with might unto the inward man " (Eph. III, 16). The same Spirit is the Spirit of unity in Christ's Church amid the wonderful varieties of Christian character and life (Eph. IV, 3). With the " sword of the Spirit " we are able to fight the battles of the Lord (Eph. VI, 17). Through the " supply of the Spirit " opposition and affection turn out unto salvation (Phil. I, 19). " By the Holy Ghost who dwelleth in us " Timothy is admonished to " keep the good thing committed to his trust " (II Tim. I, 14). The same Spirit is the principle of our progressive holiness: " God hath not called us unto uncleanness, but unto sanctification. Therefore he that despiseth these things, despiseth not man, but God, who hath also given his holy Spirit in us " (I Thess. IV, 7, 8) ;" God hath chosen you, first fruits

1. For a clear and concise exposé of the nature of the charismatic gifts both in general and in particular, as well as for an extensive bibliography, cf. FONCK, *Quaestiones paulinae*, p. 57 ff.

unto salvation, in sanctification of the Spirit " (II Thess. II, 12).

These then are the different effects of the Spirit's indwelling within us [1]. It is not our purpose here to study them all in detail except in so far as they have immediate reference to our present study. Hence in the following pages we propose to consider the Spirit in so far as He is the principle of the Christian's moral life, in so far as by participation of the Spirit we have adoptive filiation, justification, sanctification, and glorification. For if formerly we were helpless sinners, doing not the good which we would but the evil which we hated, now in the Spirit we can do all things because He comforts us, and because His grace is sufficient for us. If formerly we were servants and slaves of Sin, of the flesh, and of the devil, now we are sons because God has sent the Spirit of liberty into our hearts. If formerly we were enemies of God and under the divine sentence of condemnation, now we are justified and restored to the friendship of God because our sins have been forgiven and sanctifying grace, which is an effect of the Spirit's indwelling in us, infused into our souls. If formerly we belonged to unregenerate humanity, and bore the image of the " old " and " earthly " man, now in the Spirit we are being continually sanctified, made a new creation, and so bear the image of the heavenly man. And if formerly we were subject to death and to all the misery which death implies, henceforth death is powerless to hold its prey because of the Spirit, Who dwells in us, and Who is also a pledge that on the great day of the Parousia our body will be completely redeemed when " the enemy death shall be destroyed last. " All these blessings which Christ juridically procured for us on the Cross, we now share effectively by our participation of His Spirit received in the sacraments.

Art. I. — THE SPIRIT, THE PRINCIPLE OF THE CHRISTIAN'S MORAL LIFE.

By the death of Christ on the Cross Sin indeed received a mortal blow and was rendered powerless, but it was not de-

1. Cf. Lebreton, o. c., p. 325 ff., Downer, *Mission and Ministration of the Spirit*, pp. 147-172, Scott, *The Spirit in the New Testament*, pp. 127-293, Swete, *The Holy Spirit in the New Testament*[2], pp. 169-253, Moffatt, *Paul and Paulinism*, p. 48 ff.

stroyed completely. The Christian has still to struggle against concupiscence which would bring him anew under servitude and bondage. In fact, it would avail man little to be delivered from the penalty of past sins, if he were fatally to fall again under the tyranny of the Sin-principle and become anew the object of God's wrath. So too the flesh, the vehicle and seat of Sin, was not entirely annihilated by Christ's Death. The interior conflicts dramatically described in Rom. c. VII continue also in the Christian. The warfare between the spirit and the flesh is incessantly maintained, and the Christian who enlists in the ranks of the flesh will again incur condemnation and death: "If you live according to the flesh, you shall die, for the wisdom of the flesh is death because it is an enemy of God" (Rom. VIII, 13, 6, 7). To the Christian Galatians the Apostle likewise writes: "Walk in the Spirit and you shall not fulfil the lusts of the flesh. For the flesh lusteth against the spirit and the spirit against the flesh. For these are contrary to one another. He that soweth in his flesh, of the flesh also shall reap corruption. But he that soweth in the spirit, of the spirit shall reap life everlasting" (Gal. V, 16, 17; VI, 8). Against the spirit-powers the Christian must also continue to struggle: "Put on the armour of God, that you may be able to stand against the deceits of the devil. For our wrestling is not against flesh and blood, but against principalities and powers, against the rulers of the world of this darkness, against the spirits of wickedness in the high places" (Eph. VI, 11, 12).

But though the Christian must still battle against these hostile powers, henceforth he does not fight alone but has the aid of the Spirit Whom he received when through baptism he was incorporated into the mystic Christ. If the power of Sin is not yet completely annihilated, from now on its force is not irresistible; the Christian is no longer its slave but has the necessary force and strength to overcome the concupiscences of the flesh and so also gain the merit of victory. This tyranny of Sin was, as we have said above, juridically broken by Christ's atoning death: what the Law could not do God has done by sending His Son into the world in an assumed human nature, which was in all things like unto ours except that it was sinless, and by condemning in Christ's flesh on the Cross the power of Sin. This victory however does not become effective for us until at the Resurrection when Christ becomes a "vivifying

spirit." For it is by a participation of Christ's Spirit that we appropriate subjectively the atoning virtue of the Redemption. It is by union with the living Christ that we receive the strength to resist sin, and this force is no other than the divine πνεῦμα, which emanates from the Risen Christ, and which we share by our incorporation into the Church through baptism. So too it is owing to his union with the glorified Christ and to his communion of His Spirit (Rom. VIII, 2, 4, 9) that the Christian is no longer a slave of his flesh but can mortify its works (Rom. VIII, 13). It is because the Christian lives by the Spirit that he can also walk according to the Spirit, refusing to satisfy the concupiscences of the flesh and producing the fruits of the Spirit (Gal. V, 16-25). Finally, it is likewise from his union with the Risen Christ that the Christian derives this Divine antidote against the poisonous darts of Satan, so that henceforth nothing " neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor might, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord " (Rom. VIII, 38, 39 ; cf. Eph. VI, 17, 18).

Because the Spirit characterizes the New Covenant the latter is as different from the Old as life is from death [1]. Moses, the unique prophet of Judaism, is surpassed by every believer, because his glory was waning whilst theirs is ever waxing and transforming them by virtue of the power of the Spirit Who is ever being given to them. In fact, the Law was a destroyer, the Spirit is the Life-giver ; the former was powerless and a mere outward form, the latter is an enabling power for real service

1. Not only did the " ministration of the Spirit " surpass *toto coelo* the regime of the letter but the Apostle's Gospel, because it was energized and inspired by the same Spirit, excelled in like measure the worldly wisdom of the Greeks. If the preachers of the Gospel proclaimed their message with a power and eloquence which showed its divine origin, and if the converts received it with much joy and assurance, this was due to the workings of the Holy Spirit (I Thess. I, 5, 6). The Apostle disclaimed altogether the role of the Greek rhetor and sophist, and the Corinthians would hear from him none of those artifices of speech to which they were accustomed in the lectures of the vagrant philosopher (I Cor. II, 4). For the Christian philosophy and Divine wisdom, which the messengers of the Cross proclaimed, was revealed to them by God through His Holy Spirit (I Cor. II, 10-11). As in man there is a self-conscious life which is conversant with the secrets of his heart, so also the Divine Spirit is cognizant of the secrets of God, and this Spirit Saint Paul claims has been imparted to him (I Cor. II, 12).

of God (cf. Gal. III, 21 ; Rom. II, 29 ; Phil. III, 3). " God hath made us fit ministers of the new testament, " says the Apostle, " not in the letter, but in the Spirit. For the letter killeth, but the Spirit quickeneth " (II Cor. III, 6). And if the Old Covenant had its glory and splendours, " how shall not the ministration of the Spirit be rather in glory? For if the ministration of comdemnation be glory, much more the ministration of justice aboundeth in glory. For if that which is done away was glorious, much more that which remaineth in glory " (II Cor. III, 8-11) [1].

We have briefly outlined here the new life of the Christian convert in the liberty of the Spirit. But our incorporation into the mystic Christ and our participation of Christ's Spirit has another consequence, as real and sublime as the above, namely that of adoptive filiation. Having put on Christ, and participating in the Life which flows from the Head to the members, we become the sons of God and coheirs of Christ.

Art. II. — ADOPTIVE FILIATION.

It was again through the mediation of Christ that God predestined us to divine filiation : " He hath predestined us unto the adoption of children (υἱοθεσία) through Jesus Christ unto himself, according to the purpose of his will, unto the praise of the glory of his grace, in which he hath graced us in his beloved Son, in whom we have redemption through his blood, the remission of sins, according to the riches of his grace "

1. Swete, *The Holy Spirit in the New Testament*, p. 195 : " The religion of the Spirit, the religion which brings righteousness, the religion which alone possesses finality, must needs exceed in glory the religion of the Law, which brought condemnation and from its very nature was transitory and propaedeutic. That the Law was not permanent or final had been symbolized by the fading away of the radiance on the face of Moses, which he sought to screen from the eyes of the Israelites by throwing a veil over it. This veil remains on the hearts of his followers, for Israel cannot yet see that the Old Covenant has served its end and found its fulfilment in the religion of the Spirit. But whenever the day shall come for Israel to turn to the Lord Christ, the veil will be taken off, even as Moses uncovered his face when he went back into the Divine Presence. With believers, whether Jews or Greeks (ἡμεῖς πάντες), this time has already come ; they enter the Presence with unveiled face, and reflecting as on the burnished brass of a mirror the glory of the ascended Lord, they are by degrees transformed into His image ".

(Eph. I, 5-7 ; cf. Rom. VIII, 28-29). Similarly in Gal. IV, 4 the Apostle connects God's purpose to make us partakers of sonship with the sending of the Son into the world and His being made subject to the Law : " When the fulness of time was come, God sent his Son, made of a woman, made under the law, that he might redeem them who were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons. " The basis of our sonship accordingly is the redemptive work of Christ.

This adoption is effectively realized by our incorporation into the Church, by our communion of Christ's Life and participation of His Spirit. It is by our incorporation into Christ that we partake of the quality of son of God, which Christ Himself possesses in a transcendent manner, and have created within us the mentality of son instead of the disposition of slave[1]. Hence adoption can be regarded as prior or as simultaneous with the communication of the Spirit, according as it is considered as an objective effect of the Redemption or as a subjective appropriation (cf. Gal. IV, 5, 6 and III, 26, 27). This Spirit of God (Rom. VIII, 14) and of Christ (Gal. IV, 6) in communicating Himself to us, constitutes us really and truly adopted sons of God and brothers of Christ, and at the same time renders testimony of our adoptive filiation : " For the Spirit himself giveth testimony (συνμαρτυρεῖ [2]) to our spirit that we are the sons of God " (Rom. VIII, 16). The Holy Ghost joins our spirit in bearing witness that we are truly the adopted children of God, because it is by the impulse of this Holy Spirit, together with our own, that we, with filial love, invoke God by the name of Ἀββᾶ, ὁ πατήρ. It must be observed however that short of a special divine revelation we can never be absolutely certain

---

1. DUPERRAY, *Le Christ dans la vie chrétienne d'après saint Paul*², pp. 49-50 : " Dans la grande famille de Dieu, il y a comme deux dégrés de filiation, analogues mais subordonnés, celle de Jésus et celle des chrétiens, l'une directe, naturelle : celle de Jésus par rapport à Dieu le Père ; l'autre indirecte, " participée ": celle des chrétiens " cohéritiers " du Père, frères cadets de Jésus, fils aîné. La filiation divine de Jésus-Christ, c'est la source d'où découle la filiation des chrétiens, devenus participants de la vie du Christ ". Cf. LEBRETON, o. c., p. 361, BRUCE, *St. Paul's Conception of Christianity*, p. 187 ff., ZORELL, o. c., p. 579, JOYCE, *The Catholic Doctrine of Grace*, pp. 1-12.

2. The term συγμαρτυρεῖ, it is to be noted, is not equivalent to μαρτυρεῖ. The preposition σύν in the former denotes the fact that the testimony of the Holy Spirit " crying Abba, Father, in our hearts " (Gal. IV, 6) joins and confirms ours when in spirit " we cry : Abba (Father) " (Rom. VIII, 15).

that we have sanctifying grace and are sons of God, but moral certitude is all that we can hope for.

In Gal. III, 22, IV, 7 our adoptive filiation is contrasted with our former servitude to sin and to the Law. Till the coming of Christ, the Jews, although in reality sons and heirs to the inheritance, were like minors, under guardians and stewards, enslaved by the elementary rules that pertained to things merely material and external. And the state of the Gentiles was by no means superior to that of the former. All, therefore, Jews and Gentiles, were like children who had lost their father, waiting for the expiration of the time of their minority. When the fulness of time fixed by the Father had come, God sent His Son that He might redeem those in bondage, making all who through faith participate of His grace His adopted sons. In Rom. VIII, 12-17 our filiation is contrasted with our former bondage to the flesh and to death: " brethren we are debtors, not to the flesh, to live according to the flesh. For if you live according to the flesh, you shall die. But if by the spirit you mortify the deeds of the flesh you shall live. For whosoever are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God. For you have not received the spirit of bondage again in fear, but you have received the spirit of adoption of sons whereby we cry: Abba, Father. " Those therefore who are governed by the Spirit, and who consequently repress and control the desires of the flesh, are the sons of God, because sanctifying grace, communicated to them by the Holy Spirit, unites them to Christ, and makes them members of His mystical body. In baptism they received not the spirit of bondage or slavery which they formerly possessed, and which made them serve God, as unwilling slaves their master, without affection and from fear, but they received a disposition of mind and soul which enables them to serve God out of love [1].

1. The term " adoption " as used by the Apostle had no doubt a somewhat different meaning from that which it bears at the present day. In modern times the term signifies little more than the intention to educate the adopted child and to bequeath to him later a son's inheritance. This purpose is revocable and confers no legal rights. Under the Roman law, on the contrary, sanctions of adoption were of the strongest kind, and the rights conferred were similar to those which attach to natural sonship. The adoption could not be reversed save through legal formalities just as strictly prescribed as those by which he had been admitted. Yet, human adoption, however strong are the sanctions given to it, remains at best a legal fiction. No legal instrument

In two places where the Apostle speaks of our filiation he intimately connects it with the Messianic inheritance : Gal. IV, 7 : " Therefore, now he is not a servant but a son, and if a son, an heir also through God, " and Rom. VIII, 17 ; " And if sons, heirs also ; heirs indeed of God and joint-heirs with Christ ; yet so, if we suffer with him, that we may also be glorified with him. " Sonship then brings with it the right of inheritance [1]. As God's children we shall one day inherit His kingdom (Eph. I, 13, 14, 18 ; Col. III, 24), not of course of our own natural right, but through Christ and because of our union with Him. It is only by reason of our union with the Head, the Second Adam, that we have a right to share in the eternal goods and blessings which are His by nature. But we shall be glorified with Christ only on condition that here below we suffer in union with Him. As He only through humiliation, sufferings, and death, entered into His glory, so we also must in all things be like unto Him, and bear our sufferings in union with Him and in a disposition akin to His. That we shall one day enter on this our inheritance with Christ of this the Spirit is the pledge (Eph. I, 14 ; Tit. III, 6 ; Gal. III, 13-14).

We have rapidly surveyed above the salutary effects of the Death and Resurrection of Christ. We have seen how humanity was reconciled with God in Christ, delivered from the servitude of sin, and placed in a state of adoptive filiation. But we have yet another phase of the Pauline soteriology to consider, namely, the justice and justification which Christ procured for us by His redemptive work. This aspect is in fact neither new

---

can make a person what he is not, or alter his personal characteristics so as to render him in this regard the heir of the family into which he has been adopted. But it is otherwise with Divine adoption. When man becomes a son of God, he becomes what he was not before : he is born again, and is enriched with new powers and qualities which make him in some mysterious way like to God.

2. In regard to this Divine inheritance JOYCE, o. c., pp. 26-27, remarks : " We must be careful to avoid the limitations involved in the idea of inheritance as it is known among men. The material possessions which men own here can belong to one person only at a time : and for that reason a son cannot inherit as long as his father lives. As regards spiritual riches it is otherwise. They can be held by many simultaneously, and the increase in the number of those who hold them does not diminish the full possession enjoyed by each. Men inherit the kingdom of God when they are elevated to a share in those spiritual treasures which make the blessedness of God. It is this which our adoption secures for us. The beatitude which by nature would be the exclusive prerogative of the Three Divine Persons, becomes ours also ".

nor different from the former, but has a close affinity with the other effects of the Redemption, and enters naturally into the cycle of ideas which we have been heretofore considering.

Art. III. — JUSTICE AND JUSTIFICATION.

The Apostle is always careful to indicate that the means which God chose to enable us to procure our own justice was not the Law ; in the judgment of Saint Paul it was never the Law, but under the Old Dispensation it was the Promise and in the era of fulfilment it is Christ. The purpose of Christ's death, says the Apostle, was to procure our justice : " If justice be by the law, then Christ died in vain " (Gal. II, 21). For the " ministration of condemnation, " the Law, is substituted the " ministration of justice ", the Gospel (II Cor. III, 9). Christ has become our justice, in order that by union with Him we too might find justice : " But of him (God) are you in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom, and justice, and sanctification, and redemption " (I Cor. I, 30) ; " Him who knew no sin he hath made sin for us, that we might be made the justice of God (δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ) in Him " (II Cor. V, 21). Secondly, just as in Christ we have justice so also by that very fact and by means of that justice we find justification in Him : " we seek to be justified in Christ " (Gal. II, 17), " we are now justified by his blood " (Rom. V, 9). In the following pages we shall consider more in detail the meaning of " justice " and especially of the Pauline formula δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ, a study, which in turn will enable us to understand better the process of justification. [1]

---

1. Cf. Colon, *Justice et justification d'après le Nouveau Testament*, p. 100 ff., Tobac. *Le problème de la justification dans saint Paul*, p. 115 ff., 206 ff., Prat, *La théologie de saint Paul*, vol. I[9], pp. 199-201, vol. II[6], 291 ff., 546 ff., Cornely, *Epistola ad Romanos*, p. 68 ff., Monse, *Johannes und Paulus*, NT, 1915, p. 128 ff., Bartmann, *St. Paulus und St. Jacobus über die Rechtfertigung*, BS, 1897, p. 56 ff., Benz, *Die Ethik des Apostels Paulus*, BS, 1912, p. 29 ff., Lagrange, *Épître aux Romains*, pp. 119-141, also by the same author art. *La justification d'après saint Paul*, RB, 1914, pp. 321-343, 481-503, Tobac, art. *La* δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ *dans saint Paul*, RHE, 1908, pp. 1-18, Frutsaert, art. *La " justice de Dieu " dans saint Paul*, RechSR, 1911, pp. 167-182, Lattey, art. *De justitia impertita*, VDni, 1924, pp. 149-153, Pohle, art. *Justification*, CE, vol. VIII, pp. 573-578, Lattey-Keating, *The Westminster*

I. THE " JUSTICE OF GOD " Δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ.

The Pauline formula, δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ, has been variously interpreted by different theologians and exegetes. Some as Kühl [1], who regard a " justice of God, " which would be an inherent quality of the Christian, with the greatest suspicion and defiance, understand δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ in the theological sense, and maintain that it denotes the personal immanent justice of God pure and simple. Among many modern theologians, however, who incline towards this view, the immanent justice of God has become less static and more dynamic, in order to become, in fact, the justifying and salvific activity of God [2]. Others as Bartmann [3], and Benz [4], distinguish between a justice which is immanent and proper to God, and a justice which is communicated to men. In order to preserve unity and harmony in the Apostle's thought, these theologians and certain others as Prat [5], Lemonnyer [6], and Toussaint [7], consider δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ as at once the personal justice of God and as the model and source of the justice in man ; it is accordingly one and the same justice which is active in God in order to communicate itself to man, and which in man is as it were the prolongation,

---

Version of the Sacred Scriptures, vol. III, App. p. 243 ff., JOYCE, *The Catholic Doctrine of Grace*, pp. 43, 47.

SANDAY, *Epistle to the Romans*[5], p. 24 ff., WILLIAMS, *A Plea for a Re-consideration of St. Paul's Doctrine of Justification* p. 128 ff. SHEARS, *The Gospel according to St. Paul (an Attempt to Elucidate St. Paul's Doctrine of Sin and Justification)*, p. 50 ff., WESTCOTT, *St. Paul and Justification, passim.*, STEVENS, art. *The Forensic Meaning of* δικαιοσύνη, AJT, 1897, pp. 443-450, GOULD, art. *St. Paul's Use of* δικαιοῦν, AJT, 1897, pp. 149-158, ROPES, art. *" Righteousness " and " Righteousness of God " in the Old Testament and in St. Paul*, JBL, 1903, pp. 211-227, DAVIES, art. *The ' Righteousness of God ' in St. Paul*, JTS, Pt II., 1900-1901, pp. 198-206, DRUMMOND, art. *On the Meaning of " Righteousness of God " in the Theology of St. Paul*, HJ, 1902, pp. 83-95, 1903, pp. 272-293, MACHOLZ, art. *Zum Verständnis des paulinischen Rechtfertigungsgedankens*, THSK, 1915, pp. 29-61.

1. *Der Brief des Paulus an die Römer*, p. 41 ff.
2. Cf. SANDAY, *Epistle to the Romans*[5], pp. 24-25, 34-35.
3. *St. Paulus und St. Jacobus über die Rechtfertigung*, BS, 1897, pp. 60-70.
4. *Die Ethik des Apostels Paulus*, BS, 1912, pp. 29-51.
5. O. c., vol. II[6], p. 295.
6. *Épîtres de saint Paul*, vol. I, p. 254 ff.
7. *Épître aux Romains*, p. 54 ff ; so too COLON, *Justice et justification d'après le Nouveau Testament*, p. 107.

" reflection, " and " effect, " of the divine justice [1]. In the following passages we shall examine the formula in those passages where it has direct reference to justification, and we shall find that the anthropological sense, according to which δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ is an inherent quality of man, is the one which best explains the texts and the context [2]. The " justice of God " is a *justitia in homine ex Deo*. It is a justice which one receives from the gratuitous goodness of God, and not because of the works of the Law.

A. *Anthropological, not Theological.*

The principal texts which we shall consider in our attempt to elucidate the meaning of δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ are Rom. x, 3 and Phil. iii, 9, Rom. i, 17, Rom. iii, 21-26, and II Cor. v, 21 [3]. In Rom. x, 3 we read : ἀγνοοῦντες γὰρ τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ δικαιοσύνην, καὶ τὴν ἰδίαν ζητοῦντες στῆσαι, τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ τοῦ θεοῦ οὐχ ὑπετάγησαν ; similarly in Phil. iii, 9 ; καὶ εὑρεθῶ ἐν αὐτῷ, μὴ ἔχων ἐμὴν δικαιοσύνην τὴν ἐκ νόμου, ἀλλὰ τὴν διὰ πίστεως Χριστοῦ, τὴν ἐκ θεοῦ δικαιοσύνην ἐπὶ τῇ πίστει. In these two passages Saint Paul speaks of a justice which is acquired by works of the Law and a justice received from God (ἐκ θεοῦ). Both the one and the other are of the same nature,

---

1. Cf. also Tobac, *Le problème de la justification dans saint Paul*, p. 115 ff., also art. *La* δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ *dans saint Paul*, RHE, 1908, pp. 1-18, Lagrange, *Épître aux Romains*, p. 119 ff.

2. Frutsaert, *La " justice de Dieu " dans saint Paul*, RechSR, 1911, pp. 167-182, Cornely, *Epistola ad Romanos*, p. 68 f.

3. We might note here the striking similarity of expression in these texts :

Rom. i, 17: Δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ	ἐκ πίστεως	εἰς πίστιν.
Rom. iii, 21-26 : Δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ (21)	διὰ πίστεως Ἰ. Χ.	εἰς πάντας τοὺς πιστεύοντας (22).
Rom. x, 3 : Δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ (3)	ἡ ἐκ πίστεως (6)	παντὶ τῷ πιστεύοντι (4).
II Cor. v, 21 : Δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ	ἐν αὐτῷ (διὰ πίστεως)	
Phil. iii, 9: Τὴν ἐκ θεοῦ δικαιοσύνη	ἐπὶ τῇ πίστει.	

In Rom. iii, 5 : " But if our injustice commend the justice of God (θεοῦ δικαιοσύνην) what shall we say ? Is God just, who executeth wrath " (cf. iii, 7, ἡ ἀλήθεια θεοῦ), the expression δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ is a synonym of ἀλήθεια θεοῦ and is opposed to ἀπιστία, ψεύσματι, etc. ; it is the fidelity of God to His promises. But while the term here no doubt designates a divine attribute, we are outside of a context which has immediate reference to justification.

in both cases there is question of a justice by which one is or desires to be formally just. The difference lies only in the genesis of this justice; δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ accordingly denotes a quality of man which has its source in God. In this text we find enunciated two ideas, namely, a false notion of the conditions of justice, and secondly, the conduct which that conception inspired. The former comprises two elements: a stubborn pretension to acquire justice by works, and a disregard of the fact that it ought to come from God. The opposition implied in this double persuasion lies in the respective object, i. e., in the justice coming from God and in the justice acquired by works. Man's conduct is described in connection with the negative element which inspires it, τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ τοῦ θεοῦ οὐχ ὑπετάγησαν; "considering this frame of mind we can readily understand how they would not submit themselves to "the justice of God," i. e., the justification which God communicates to men, which is a gratuitous gift of God dependent upon faith in Christ" [1]. The word ὑπετάγησαν offers no difficulty to our interpretation if we remark that in the preceding chapter, IX, 31, the Apostle speaks of a νόμος δικαιοσύνης (cf. Gal. VI, 2; I Cor. IX, 21; Rom. 7); hence the idea of *submission* becomes altogether natural. Furthermore, the δικαιοσύνη of Rom. X, 3 is evidently the same as the δικαιοσύνη of IX, 30-32 ("What then shall we say? That the Gentiles who followed not after justice, have attained to justice, even the justice that is of faith. But Israel, by following after the law of justice, is not come unto the law of justice. Why so? because they sought it not by faith, but as it were of works"), and X, 4-6 ("For the end of the law is Christ, unto justice to every one that believeth. For Moses wrote that the justice which is of the law, the man that shall do it shall live by it"). Now in these passages, which immediately precede and follow Rom. X, 3, δικαιοσύνη has the anthropological sense, for the terms ἔφθασε and διώκων (IX, 30, 31) cannot reasonably be understood of the immanent justice of God; moreover, IX, 32 explains clearly the τὴν ἰδίαν of X, 3: it is a justice sought by legal observances and opposed to that which God gratuitously confers on faith (Rom. X, 4). Our

1. CALLAN, *The Epistles of St. Paul*, vol. I, p. 166; cf. also PRAT, o. c., vol. II[6], p. 293, COLON, o. c., p. 111, WESTCOTT, *St. Paul and Justification*, p. 360 ff.

interpretation of Rom. x, 3 is also confirmed by Phil. III, 9 where we find the same antithesis between a justice which is acquired and a justice which is received from God (ἐμὴν — ἐκ θεοῦ).

A text intimately related to the above is that of Rom. I, 17 : δικαιοσύνη γὰρ θεοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ ἀποκαλύπτεται ἐκ πίστεως εἰς πίστιν, καθὼς γέγραπται· ὁ δὲ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται. Here again it is difficult to interpret this text as referring to an uncreated justice. For how can the intrinsic justice of God be ἐκ πίστεως εἰς πίστιν ? And what relation is there between the manifestation of this eternal justice and the prophet's assertion, ὁ δὲ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται ? If, on the contrary, there is question here of justice in the anthropological sense, one can easily understand how the justice produced by God in man is ἐκ πίστεως, since faith is a necessary condition of its manifestation, how it progresses εἰς πίστιν, since faith is its principle and measure, and how its exists and reveals in itself the Gospel in conformity with the ancient prophecies, since Habakkuk speaks of justice in the anthropological sense. The Apostle, after having demonstrated in the first two chapters of his epistle to the Romans the thesis enunciated in I, 17 : δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ ἐκ πίστεως, after having described in c. III-VIII this new and wonderful system, begins in c. IX to solve the painful problem of the exclusion of the Jews from the new economy. Now the justice from which the Jews were excluded (εἰς νόμον οὐχ ἔφθασε) was, as we have seen above, an inherent anthropological justice, and is the same as that of which the Apostle inaugurated the demonstration in I, 17. At this point one might confront us with a difficulty based on the usage of δύναμις θεοῦ (v. 16) and ὀργὴ θεοῦ; just as these two expressions, which we find in the immediate proximity of δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ, denote divine attributes so also the latter. As far as δύναμις θεοῦ is concerned it is clear, however, that it is not a divine attribute [1].

1. COLON, o. c., p. 105 : " Lorsque, Rom. I, 16, l'apôtre dit que l'Évangile est une force de Dieu, on ne voit pas comment cette force (δύναμις) peut s'entendre d'un attribut, puisque c'est l'Évangile entendu de sa prédication ou de son contenu. L'abstrait est mis pour le concret, nous sommes en présence d'un instrument, d'un agent puissant au service de Dieu, par lequel Dieu manifeste son propre attribut et qui en découle, qui y participe. Ce n'est pas ce qu'on entend par attribut. Que l'attribut de puissance se manifeste par l'Évangile, d'accord, mais que l'Évangile soit l'attribut lui-même,

In fact it is identified with the Gospel, for the Apostle does not say as in v. 17 ἐν αὐτῷ αποκαλύπτεται but ἐστιν. Moreover, the term is anarthous, and the sense consequently is *a* force, *a* power of God, and not *the* force, *the* power of God (cf. I Cor. I, 18 ; comp. also I Cor. I, 24 and 30). The expression, ὀργὴ θεοῦ, is used in the Pauline Epistles in the sense of punishment, and denotes only indirectly the " sentiment " whence it proceeds (cf. Rom. II, 5, III, 5, IX, 24, XIII, 4, Eph. V, 6 ; Col. III, 6). Furthermore, ὀργὴ θεοῦ is not mentioned here for its own sake but to denote the thought which dominates this whole section, namely, the universality of sin and the helplessness of man to arrive at justice by his own powers. The contrast then is not between a double divine activity but between two states of humanity : to be outside of the Gospel is to be in sin, to submit oneself to the salutary influence of the Gospel is to obtain justice.

The theme of Rom. I, 17 reappears [1] and becomes more precise in Rom. III, 21-26 : Νυνὶ δὲ χωρὶς νόμου δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ πεφανέρωται, μαρτυρουμένη ὑπὸ τοῦ νόμου καὶ τῶν προφητῶν, δικαιοσύνη δὲ θεοῦ διὰ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, εἰς πάντας τοὺς πιστεύοντας. Here again the justice of God which is by the faith of Jesus Christ and which is destined unto all believers is a justice which is inherent in man. This justice comes from God, for it is independent of the Law and is not attained by human efforts. It has for it the testimony of the Law and of the prophets, since Abraham, according to Genesis, owed his justification to faith, and since the just, according to the prophet Habakkuk, shall live by faith. This manifestation of the "justice of God without the law " was to be for God a source of glory, of that glory of which obstinate and pretentious Judaism strove to rob Him. Towards the realization of this glory two factors

---

l'apôtre ne le dit pas. Cf. I Cor. I, 18 : ὁ λόγος γὰρ ὁ τοῦ σταυροῦ... μωρία ἐστί... δύναμις θεοῦ ἐστιν, qui est très suggestif ". Cf. also PRAT, o. c., vol. II[6], p. 294, FRUTSAERT, o. c., p. 176, CALLAN, o. c., p. 31, WESTCOTT, o. c, pp. 129-130.

1. Compare

Rom. I, 17	Rom. III, 21-26
Ἐν αὐτῷ (εὐαγγελίῳ) (17[a])	Νυνὶ δὲ χωρὶς νόμου (21[a])
ἀποκαλύπτεται (17[b])	πεφανέρωται (21[b])
δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ ἐκ πίστεως εἰς πίστιν (17[b])	δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ διὰ πίστεως (22[a]) εἰς πάντας τοὺς πιστεύοντας (22[b])
καθὼς γέγραπται (17[c]).	μαρτυρουμένη ὑπὸ τοῦ νόμου καὶ τῶν προφητῶν (21[c]).

were to contribute, first, the universality of sin and the powerlessness of man to acquire justice, and, second, the decree of Redemption, whence justification flows as a gratuitous gift. In the presence of these two factors the δόξα θεοῦ was to become evident by way of contrast. For on the one hand man is a sinner and incapable of arriving at justice by his own powers, and on the other hand God is just and an overflowing source of justice. This same antithesis was to illustrate in a striking manner that aspect of justice which the Gospel manifestation was to bring out, namely, that justice comes not from human efforts but from the gracious goodness of God [1].

Finally, there remains to be examined the strange and anomalous expression in II Cor. v, 21 : τὸν μὴ γνόντα ἁμαρτίαν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἁμαρτίαν ἐποίησεν, ἵνα ἡμεῖς γενώμεθα δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ. Here again the " justice of God " of which there is question cannot be a divine attribute, for it is impossible to conceive how we could become a divine modality. The Apostle tells us that by a sublime condescension of God the just became sin in order that sinners might become justice. Jesus Christ, the Head of the human race, personifies sin, is made " sin for us. " However, He is neither a sinner nor sin personally except in so far as He is a member of the sinful family whose cause He espoused. But while He Who by His nature is impeccable cannot become a sinner by His contact and union with sinners, our union with Him, the Just One *par excellence*, renders us truly just. His justice extends itself from Him to us when we receive the adoptive filiation. This justice, because it comes not from us but from grace, is called " justice of God, " i. e. from God.

The expression, δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ, in the Pauline Epistles, whenever it has immediate reference to justification, is therefore

1. It is sometimes objected that in our passage it is also stated that God manifests His justice — evidently His intrinsic justice — in exposing the Crucified as a means of propitiation, and that consequently the same expression ought to retain the same meaning in the same context. " Ce principe ", says PRAT, o. c., vol. II[6], p. 295, " en ce qui concerne saint Paul, est certainement faux ; et si l'on appliquait à la rigueur on aboutirait souvent à une exégèse forcée, puérile et absurde ". " Il suffit ", says also LAGRANGE, art. *La justification d'après saint Paul*, RB, 1914, p. 334, " pour répondre à cet argument de noter que Paul a employé dans cinq sens différents le mot νόμος au cours d'une argumentation beaucoup plus subtile, en la même phrase (Rom. VII, 21-23) ".

to be understood in the anthropological sense, i. e., it is a justice which is in man. Saint Paul employs the genitive of origin, θεοῦ, in order to contrast the true justice which is a gift of God with the justice which the Jews strove to acquire by their own unaided powers. To denote the process whereby we obtain this justice which comes from God, which is not acquired by works, and which is a quality of man, the Apostle employs the verb δικαιοῦν. The question which accordingly arises is this: does the verb denote a justice which is real or forensic, actual or eschatological, inherent or imputed ?

B. *Real, not Forensic.*

Many Protestant scholars maintain that δικαιοῦν, in spite of its causative form, signifies " to declare " and not " to render" just. Thus, according to Stevens [1] δικαιοσύνη in all its meanings has back of it the idea of law. The argument in the first five chapters of Romans, he says, aims not to prove that law exists or that men are sinners, but that as sinners they are personally responsible, accountable to the law, and subject to condemnation ; it is distinctly forensic from beginning to end, in terms and in method. Δίκαιος and its cognates do not in themselves contain the idea of moral excellence, but only that of an objective relation to the law. Legality not virtue, is the essential factor. With Paul, a Pharisee trained in Judaistic theology, it could indeed hardly be otherwise. Secondly, the same author tells us, δικαιοσύνη has back of it the idea of violated law. The Pauline indictment (Rom. I-V) aims chiefly to establish the fact of the sinner's accountability to the law rather than his unholiness and the moral evil of his condition. Thirdly, from Rom. III, 21-26 it is evident that with Saint Paul δικαιοσύνη derives its forensic sense from the verb δικαιόω and its cognate noun δικαιώσις. And finally, δικαιοσύνη in its strictly forensic meaning, and denoting the result of a δικαίωσις, is legal acceptableness, the status before the law of a pardoned sinner.

The view of Ropes [2] is similar to the above. According to

1. Art. *The Forensic Meaning of* Δικαιοσύνη, AJT, 1897, pp. 443-450.
2. Art. *' Righteousness ' and ' the Righteousness of God ' in the Old Testament and in St. Paul,* JBL, 1903, Pt II, p. 220 ff.

this author Saint Paul, influenced by Isaias and the Psalms, understood the formula " righteousness of God " in the sense of " God's vindication of man. " Besides the word δικαιοσύνη, however, the Apostle uses also the term δικαιόω, a word not very common in the Old Testament but made by later Jewish usage a standing term of the religious vocabulary. This word means " to pronounce righteous " or " acquit, " and pertains to the Apostle's fundamental conception of the moral relation of God to man. In the act of the judge, denoted by it, his righteousness, i. e., his moral excellence and especially his mercy, is exercised, and righteousness, i. e., the status of one who has received a favorable verdict, is bestowed on the righteous party before him. Justification, accordingly, means the favorable verdict which would be granted to a righteous man, as defendant, if, when his character and conduct were thoroughly examined before the Great Assize of the Last Day, he was found innocent.

" What Paul means by justification and its equivalent ' the righteousness of God ' ", says Morgan [1], " is scarcely any longer a matter of dispute. We are to think not of a process of inward renewal, but of a judicial sentence. The believer is acquitted at God's judgment bar, declared to be just or righteous and invested with the splendid heritage which such a verdict carries with it. "

What is to be said of the above theory ? Is the forensic character of justification so firmly established that it is no longer a " matter of dispute ? " Let us see. The Protestants maintain that δικαιοῦν in spite of its causative form signifies " to declare " and not " to make " just. For this is the ordinary sense among profane writers, they say, and verbs of this form are not causative when they are derived from an adjective which express a moral quality. That the idea of a god sanctifying man was wholly foreign to the pagan mind, and that consequently δικαιοῦν among pagan writers has the meaning of " declaring " just, we admit ; and the same meaning may be attributed to δικαιοῦν whenever in the Bible it has a finite being for subject. But when there is question of God conferring

1. *The Religion and Theology of Paul*, p. 147 ; cf. also Macholz, art. *Zum Verständnis des paulinischen Rechtfertigungsgedankens*, ThSK, 1915, pp. 29-91.

justice or of man justified by God the situation is different, and there is no reason why δικαιοῦν should not retain its causative value.

Furthermore, we must be careful not to exaggerate Saint Paul's dependence on Judaistic theology, for the justice of which the Apostle was the herald was fundamentally different from that which the Jews strove in vain to acquire. In his epistle to the Romans where Saint Paul developes the contrast between the Law and the Gospel, he characterizes the latter by the term " justice, " a word which heretofore had been the force and strength of his adversaries. In what points then did his justice differ from that of the Jews ? In the first place, the Jews considered as just those who observed the Law, who consequently would be reckoned as just by God also, and would be declared as such by Him on the last day ; on this point the antithesis is formal, since the justice of the Gospel does not come from the works of the Law. Secondly, the Jew, having attained to justice by his own efforts, could consider it as his own personal acquisition ; the justice of the Gospel on the other hand is the justice of God, and the Christian cannot regard it as issuing from his own works.

In determining the meaning of δικαιοσύνη the fundamental word from which we must start is δίκη, which originally signified custom, usage, way. Thence also arose its meaning of right, considered as established usage. Δίκαιος accordingly means " conformable to right, " and carries with it an implicit reference to a standard. While the notion of acquittal may be involved in such terms as ἀθῷος, ἀνεύθυνος, and ἀναίτιος, it is not to be sought in δίκαιος. Like our own " righteous " or " just, " the term denotes one who is really conformed to the rule of right, and not one whom a judge or a court of law has declared to be so.

In Old Testament times, the Law, which was considered to be of divine origin, was itself the absolute standard of right, to which all legislation and administration of justice had to be conformed. The Hebrews saw in righteousness and wickedness an unalterable distinction which no judicial verdict, not even that of God Himself, could set aside (Ps. VII, 9, XIII, 21, XCII, 13, CXVIII, 9, CXIX, 75). The judge who acquits the guilty and condemns the innocent (Is. V, 23) does not in any way change the intrinsic nature of the unjust or just. So too God condemns the

wicked and justifies the just (I Kings VIII, 31) because His judgment is according to the truth. It is true, as Cremer [1] insists, that the terms connected with "just" or "righteous" frequently appear as correlative to "judge" and "judgment," words, which are undoubtedly forensic terms. But the association of courts and processes of justice with righteousness or justice is altogether natural. If justice did not grow out of courts of law, the latter grew out of justice, and were instituted to enforce it (Lev. XIX, 15). The association therefore does not prove that justice is what a judge pronounces, and consequently posterior to the judge, but that it is the standard to which the judge must conform and therefore prior to him. The Old Testament accordingly lends no sanction to the opinion that righteousness denotes a forensic conception and not the quality of one who is just.

That the forensic sense of δικαιοῦν has little foundation in the Epistles of Saint Paul will become evident when we examine the term in both the passive and active voices in some of the relevant and important passages. Thus e. g., when the Apostle says in Rom. III, 24 δικαιούμενοι δωρεὰν τῇ αὐτοῦ χάριτι διὰ τῆς ἀπολυτρώσεως, how can a declaration be made by means of the Redemption, which plays the part of an instrumental cause, and whose effect consequently is something positive? This sense of "rendering" just is confirmed by Rom. III, 28 where man is not passive and where justification is produced by faith: λογιζόμεθα γὰρ δικαιοῦσθαι πίστει ἄνθρωπον (cf. Rom. III, 30, Gal. II, 16: διὰ πίστεως). In Rom. IV, 2 ("For if Abraham were justified by works, he hath whereof to glory but not before God") we have the statement that if Abraham was justified by works he has ground for boasting, but not before God; if the meaning however is that he was judged righteous by God because of his works, it is precisely with God that he would have reason to boast in that case. In Rom. V, 1: δικαιωθέντες οὖν ἐκ πίστεως, the more natural reading again is "to become just at a given moment because of faith." In Rom. V, 9 δικαιωθέντες νῦν ἐν τῷ αἵματι the causality of the redeeming Blood suggests a real effect in the faithful; if the latter were as it were steeped in the Saviour's Blood was it not to partake of His justice? In Rom. VI, 7: ὁ γὰρ ἀποθανὼν

1. *Wörterbuch der neutestamentlichen Gräcität*[9], p. 303 ff.

δεδικαίωται ἀπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας, the whole context shows that it is not the judicial act, the acquital from the accusation of sin that destroys the body of death and does away with the bondage of sin, but a real interior renewal. Again when the Apostle says: "The kingdom of God is not meat and drink, but justice, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost" (Rom. XIV, 17), he evidently considers justice to be as real an endowment and property of the Christian as peace and joy.

The forensic sense is again inapplicable in I Cor. IV, 4: "For I am not conscious to myself of anything, yet am I not hereby justified, but he that judgeth me is the Lord," οὐδὲν γὰρ ἐμαυτῷ σύνοιδα, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐν τούτῳ δεδικαίωμαι. In I Cor. VI, 11 the Apostle expressly tells that justification is synonymous with interior sanctification: "but you are washed, but you are sanctified, but you are justified in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the Spirit of our God," ἀλλὰ ἀπελούσασθε, ἀλλὰ ἡγιάσθητε, ἀλλὰ ἐδικαιώθετε.

What Christians seek is not a declaration of justice but a possession of justice by faith (Gal. II, 16, 17, ἐκ πίστεως = διὰ πίστεως). Again, when the Apostle says: "no man is justified with God," οὐδεὶς δικαιοῦται παρὰ τῷ θεῷ (Gal. III, 11). the meaning is that no one can establish his justice before God, and not declare his justice before God, for God alone can declare anyone just. In Gal. III, 24: ἵνα ἐκ πίστεως δικαιωθῶμεν, though the verb points to the future, this is only relatively to the time when we were under the Law; since the coming of Christ, however, we are justified by faith. In Tit. III, 7 the term δικαιωθέντες, which sums up the washing of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Spirit described in the preceding verses, is evidently to be understood of a real justice. From these examples it is sufficiently clear, we think, that the passive of δικαιοῦν does not require the forensic sense when there is question of Christian justification. The sense of "becoming" just not only suffices but is often required.

Nor does δικαιοῦν in the active demand a different interpretation. In Rom. III, 26: εἰς τὸν εἶναι αὐτὸν δίκαιον καί δικαιοῦντα τὸν ἐκ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ, the mention of faith as a requisite for justification renders the meaning to "make just" the more probable one. In Rom. III, 30 the eschatological sense which is suggested by the future of the verb is excluded by the causality of faith which properly characterizes the present

time and not the day of judgment ; and if God justifies by means of faith, this is to produce a real effect in the soul, i. e., to " make " just : " for it is one God, that justifieth circumcision by faith, and uncircumcision through faith, " ὁ θεος ὃς δικαιώσει... ἐκ πίστεως... διὰ τῆς πίστεως. Again, " to justify the ungodly " (Rom. IV, 5), cannot reasonably mean " to declare just the ungodly. " In Rom. VIII, 33 : θεὸς ὁ δικαιῶν, the forensic sense is again excluded, for if God has declared anyone just, judgment is rendered, and the hypothesis of a condemnation is out of the question. In Gal. III, 8 the Apostle again tells us that God justifies the Gentiles because of their faith, ἐκ πίστεως δικαιοῖ τὰ ἔθνη ὁ θεός (cf. Rom. V, 17, IX, 30). This interpretation of δικαιοῦν is confirmed by the signification of δικαίωσις in Rom. IV, 25 : ἠγέρθη διὰ τὴν δικαίωσιν ἡμῶν. If justification were only a declaration of justice, why should the Apostle speak here of the Resurrection ? Δικαίωσις consequently is not a declaration of justice, which should result rather from Christ's Death, but a " justification of life " (Rom. V, 18), i. e., an act whereby sanctifying grace and supernatural life are infused into our soul [1].

We may here conclude our remarks on the meaning of δικαιοῦν by quoting the words of Gould [2] : " I affirm with but little

1. The forensic theory of justification has been severely judged by many Protestant theologians ; thus DENNEY, art. *The Doctrine of Sin*, Exp., 1901, p. 179, writes : " It is asserted that Paul inherited from Pharisaism a certain legal conception of the relations of God and man, a conception essentially false, and that, though he rose above this conception in his spiritual experience, he was never able dialectically to transcend it in his thoughts. In his theologizing, it is said, he always starts from a forensic and judicial basis. It is this leaven of Pharisaism which puts out the maturer Christian at every turn. .....I venture to say that this whole line of thought is both unjust to the Apostle and untrue in itself " ; DRUMMOND, art. *On the Meaning of " Righteousness of God " in the Theology of St. Paul*, HJ, 1902, p. 84, likewise concludes : " righteousness (δικαιοσύνη) carries in itself no notion whatever of a forensic. act " ; DAVIES, art. *The ' Righteousness of God ' in St. Paul*, JTS, Pt. II, 1900-1901, p. 204 : " The theory, which has been supposed to be St. Paul's, that when a man has passed through an experience that is called ' believing ': God is able to impute the merits of Christ to him and regard him as a very different person from what he is, does indeed offend our sense of justice to a degree which in these days the light which has been given to us forbids us to tolerate. It is surely time that theological writers ceased to designate this theory as *forensic*. What would our *Forum* think of it ? Some of St. Paul's interpreters continuing to take for granted that this is what he held, are sorry for him, and try to excuse him on the ground of his Judaical training. But that theory is a perversion of the Pauline doctrine ".

2. Art. *St. Paul's Use of* δικαιοῦν, AJT, 1897, pp. 149-150.

hesitation that it is simply impossible to carry the meaning, *to judge righteous,* through St. Paul's writings with any attention to grammar or context ; that there are whole classes of passages in which a rational exegesis makes this use absurd; secondly, that the discarded sense, to make righteous, is the very fundamental meaning that we want, and which will satisfy both grammar and context. " Hence if God reckons the believer as just, it is because he already is so in reality ; the latter idea is the principal one and the basis of the former. Some theologians however attempt to reverse this natural order and retain the forensic character of justification by insisting on its fundamentally eschatological character.

C. *Actual, not Eschatological.*

The exponents of the eschatological character of justification maintain that faith is as it were the germ of a virtuous life, and that God, judging us according to our ideal, in some manner considers as already accomplished that which is to result from this principle. The proof usually advanced in favor of this theory, especially by Titius [1], is the fact that the futures : οἷς μέλλει λογίζεσθαι (Rom. IV, 24). δικαιώσει (Rom. III, 30), and δίκαιοι κατασταθήσονται (Rom. V, 19), are used in connection with both present and final justification (cf. δικαιωθήσονται, Rom. II, 13) ; and since the latter is essentially declaratory in its character, the same qualification is also to be applied to the former. The Apostle's statement in Gal. V, 5 : " For we in spirit by faith, wait for the hope of justice, " πνεύματι ἐκ πίστεως ἐλπίδα δικαιοσύνης ἀπεκδεχόμεθα, is likewise interpreted in an eschatological sense. Hence it is argued that Saint Paul places both first and second justification in the same eschatological perspective.

It is to this category, we think, that the view of Williams [2] is ultimately to be reduced. According to this author δίκαιος (e. g. Rom. V, 19) describes the man in his relation to salvation, and characterizes him in so far as he is qualified or eligible

1. *Der Paulinismus unter dem Gesichtspunkt der Seligkeit,* p. 159 ff.
2. *A Plea for a Re-consideration of St. Paul's Doctrine of Justification,* p. 7 ff., p. 128 ff.

for it. Δικαιοσύνη is that which a man has which will cause him to be saved, i. e., it is qualification for salvation. Δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ denotes the qualification which God sets and accepts, and δικαιόω signifies to make qualified or eligible. The author maintains that Saint Paul recognized three categories of men : first, every one starts in the state of being disqualified as a descendant of Adam ; secondly, when a person becomes a member of Christ and a child of God, he becomes not-disqualified, and the final status (which not every one is conscious of coming to in this life) is that wherein one is qualified, i. e. wherein salvation is assured. Hence λογίζεσθαι εἰς δικαιοσύνην and δικαιοῦν is a statutory making qualified or eligible for salvation ; it means " to officially reckon as constituting a qualification for salvation. "

It is true, no doubt, that the Apostle, like the Pharisees of his time, maintains the judgment to come : " We must all be manifested before the judgment-seat of Christ, that every one may receive the proper things of the body, according as he hath done, whether it be good or evil " (II Cor. v, 10), " For we shall all stand before the judgment-seat of Christ " ... " on the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ, according to my gospel " (Rom. xiv, 10, 11, 16). But if at this moment the declaration of justice is natural and in its place, must one consequently conclude that δικαιοῦσθαι has the same sense when used to denote the beginning of Christian life ? Is this not to confuse the acquisition of justice, proper to temporal life, with the final declaration and judgment ? Such a declaration is intelligible only in the Lutheran system where God, either as judge or at least as sovereign, must attribute to the Christian a justice which in reality he does not possess ; in this case the declaration has also the properties characteristic of a divine declaration in that it is certain and irrevocable, at least as long as the Christian has faith.

Saint Paul, however, who himself was conscious of no sin and whose abundant good works were meritorious of the " crown of justice " (II Tim. iv, 18), tells us that he was not *absolutely* assured of being justified or " qualified " for salvation : " I am not conscious to myself of anything, yet am I not hereby justified, but he that judgeth me, is the Lord " (I Cor. iv, 4). He clearly acknowledged that the grace of justification can be lost : " he that thinketh himself to stand, let him take heed

lest he fall " (I Cor. x, 12) ; " I chastise my body ; and bring it into subjection, lest perhaps, when I have preached to others, I myself should become a cast-away " (I Cor. ix, 27). If to the Romans he speaks so confidently and assuringly of God's assistance and grace in their salvation, his exhortations clearly indicate that the Christian can cease to belong to Christ Consequently, if first justification has not the character of a declaration promulgated definitively and irrevocably it is no longer a judicial divine sentence.

That occasionally Saint Paul uses δικαιοῦν in the future (Rom. iii, 30, iv, 24, v, 19) is no proof that he viewed justification in an eschatological perspective. For if, as we have abundantly shown above, the Apostle speaks of justification as both present and past, he can also speak of it as future, since the Christians to whom he addresses himself are not the last to embrace Christianity. In Gal. v, 5 : ἡμεῖς γὰρ πνεύματι ἐκ πίστεως ἐλπίδα δικαιοσύνης απεκδεχόμεθα, the eschatological sense is excluded by both ἐκ πίστεως and πνεύματι, for the former already suggests justification if not acquired at least as proximate while the latter clearly shows that justification is antecedent to the moment when hope begins to arise [1].

1. A text which is frequently quoted by Protestants in support of the forensic and eschatological character of justice is Rom. ii, 13 : " Not the hearers of the law are just before God, but the doers of the law shall be justified " ; here, it is argued, " just before God " and " justified " are parallel. In answer to this objection we would note that if we look upon God as the judge, those who are acquitted are necessarily those who are righteous in His sight. There is nothing to imply that one who is righteous in the sight of Him whose judgment is according to the truth (Rom. ii, 2) and Who is not mocked (Gal. vi, 7), may be really unrighteous, and that " righteous " therefore means one who is so merely through a forensic act. The Apostle is here calling back his readers from Jewish dreams of a justice that might be imputed to people who heard but broke the Law, to the solemn condition which is implied in the very notion of law and which alone can avail before Him who cannot err.

Morgan, *The Religion and Theology*, p. 147, who, as we have seen above, maintains the essentially forensic character of justification, rejects the eschatological aspect : " That the idea (of justification) is connected with that of judgment might lead one to suppose that it must be regarded as having a primarily eschatological reference. But this would be a mistake. From the first, the question relates to the believer's present standing before God. The believer is justified even now, has peace with God now ; and Paul can distinguish between this all-determining fact and salvation in the day of wrath. " Much more then, being now justified by His blood, shall we be saved from the wrath of God through Him. For, if while we were enemies, we were reconciled to God through the death of His Son, much more, being reconciled, shall we be saved by His life " — saved by Him, i. e. as the living Lord (Rom. v, 9 f., I Thess. v, 9) ".

If justification therefore is not eschatological but actual, if it is not forensic but real, it is also, by that very fact, not imputed but inherent.

D. *Inherent, not Imputed.*

The imputed-justice theory is the logical outcome of the Lutheran teaching that original sin wrought in man an utter perversion and annihilated all freedom of the will. It is likewise the ultimate conclusion of those modern theologians who regard sin as an inevitable consequence of the developing human will. Since human nature is essentially corrupted, and since concupiscence or the evil impulse in man is ineradicable, sin is never really forgiven or blotted out; it is merely concealed and cloaked by the imputed merits of Christ. "The grand feature of the justifying verdict," says Morgan [1], "is that it is given not in accordance with the facts, but in the teeth of facts, God crediting the believer with a righteousness he is far from possessing." That there is something "grand" and "wonderful" in such a conception, we admit, for it involves nothing less than a bold denial of the principle of contradiction.

The only requisite for justification, according to the above view, is "fiduciary" faith. The Christian remains just and pleasing to God as long as he clings to Christ by the "arm of faith." This justifying faith however has no moral value; it is simply a passive instrument, a purely receptive power; it exercises no causality, but is a mere *conditio sine qua non.* The justification of the sinner, being wholly in God, neither changes nor produces anything in man; it is a synthetic judgment in virtue of which the "ungodly" who in reality remains a sinner, is declared just; God in seeing the believer's faith imputes to him the merits of Christ.

Not much need be said, we think, in refutation of the above theory. The judgment of God is not arbitrary but based on the truth: "The judgment of God is according to truth against them that do such things" (Rom. II, 2); "be not deceived, God is not mocked" (Gal. VI, 7). That God "justifies the ungodly" and at the same time leaves him in the state of a

1. *The Religion and Theology of Paul*, p. 148.

sinner, is not only an impossibility but sheer nonsense [1]. Nor does the Apostle oppose faith to works in such a way as to exclude all works [2]; what he sets in opposition is, on the one hand, God's gratuitous gift which is not a fiction of the law but true justice, and on the other hand works viciated by the pretention of one's own merit independent of God. On the part of God the conditions of judgment remain the same [3]: " Not the hearers of the law are just before God, but the doers of the Law shall be justified " (Rom. II, 13); " We must all be manifested before the judgment seat of Christ, that every one may receive the proper things of the body, according as he hath done, whether it be good or evil " (II Cor. V, 10); " Be not deceived, God is not mocked. For what things a man shall sow, those also shall he reap. For he that soweth in his flesh, of the flesh shall reap corruption. But he that soweth in the spirit, of the spirit shall reap life everlasting " (Gal. VI, 7-8). The Apostle's constant preaching and his ardent solicitude for the Christian converts clearly shows that it is their conduct and not some sort of an illusory imputed justice that will count on the last day. And if it is the last judgment which is all-decisive and important, of what help is it for the Christian to be covered during his lifetime with the mantle of Christ's imputed merits, unless perhaps to find therein a pretext for " sinning more boldly? " Moreover, how can the exponents of the above theory reconcile the judgment at the beginning of the Christian life with that at the end of life ?

---

1. " Paul ", says the Protestant theologian SABATIER, *L'Apôtre Paul*[4], p. 321, " n'aurait pas eu de paroles assez sévères pour flétrir une si grossière interprétation de sa pensée ". Other Protestant writers, after having read their own theory into the Epistles of Saint Paul, are sorry for him ; BENZ, *Die Ethik des Apostels Paulus*, BS, 1912, p. 34, tells us : " Wie Schmiedel, so wälzt auch WERNLE (*Die Anfänge unserer Religion*, 189) die Schuld auf Paulus : " Wer befreit von protestantischem Vorurteil, die Rechtfertigungslehre des Paulus betrachtet, muss sie eine seiner unglücklichsten Schöpfungen nennen " (sic) ".

2. DRUMMOND, art. *On the Meaning of " Righteousness of God " in the Theology of St. Paul*, HJ, 1903, p. 292, says : " When Holsten affirms that Paul's doctrine " annihilates all moral endeavour, and makes men indifferent towards sin, because he knows himself to be the object of Divine grace (cf. Rom. V, 20, VI, 1, VII, 6) " it is almost enough to make the Apostle's bitterest foes rise in triumph from their graves ".

3. The inconsistency of the Protestant theory is well recognized by the

Many Protestant theologians as Holtzmann [1] and Feine [2], while they deny the Christian all inherent justice, maintain nevertheless that the believer is united to Christ, that his sins are forgiven, that he is an adopted son, and that the Holy Spirit, the principle of an interior and new life, dwells in his soul. In other words, if justice is a juridical fiction, sanctification is a reality. This brings us consequently to a brief statement of the full concept of justification and of its relation to sanctification.

II. JUSTIFICATION, Δικαίωσις.

Justice, as we have seen above, is the opposite of sin, and justification the opposite of condemnation. Justification is not possible save by means of the forgiveness of our sins and reconciliation with God (Rom. III, 23, 24, V, 18-9, 10-11, 15-20; II Cor. V, 19-21). The divine act of justification, accordingly, coincides partly with this cessation of enmity and the restoration of the normal relations with God. However, it is not to be considered as a mere prelude of a new life, as merely the negative aspect of a divine operation, of which sanctification would be a positive complement. But it is interior regeneration and renovation, it is the new life itself. It is not only remission of sins but, at the same time, infusion into the soul of sanctifying grace and of the gifts of the Holy Ghost, Who dwells in us as in His own temple (I Cor. III, 16). In other words, justification and sanctification in the actual order are inseparable and identical [3].

Protestant theologian RASHDALL, *The Idea of Atonement*, p. 116: "Only those who have been made really righteous can survive that judgment (II Cor. V, 10) or "be saved". And thus at bottom the Catholic theory of justification finds more support in St. Paul, and is far nearer his real thought, than the Protestant theory in its strict traditional form. If grammatically and for the purposes of his quasi-juridical argument justification means counting righteous, practically it means for St. Paul a making righteous as well. Justification in the sense of present forgiveness, may be by faith *only*, but not so ultimate salvation".

1. *Lehrbuch der neutestamentlichen Theologie*[2], pp. 131-154.

2. *Theologie des neuen Testaments*[3], p. 277 ff., 282 ff.

3. PRAT, o. c., vol. II[6], p. 302: "Si l'on compare entre elles, pour les distinguer, la justification et la sanctification, celle-ci apparaît comme une perfection positive, susceptible de progrès indéfinis, tandis que celle-là se présente surtout sous son aspect négatif — la rémission de péchés — qui ne semble pas comporter le plus ou le moins. La sanctification inclut la notion

In fact, justification according to Saint Paul is " a justification of life " (Rom. v, 8). It alternates with the renovation and regeneration of the Holy Ghost which are the fruit of baptism: " Not by the works of justice, which we have done, but according to his mercy, he saved us, by the laver of regeneration, and renovation of the Holy Ghost, whom he hath poured forth upon us abundantly, through Jesus Christ, our Saviour, that being justified by his grace we may be heirs, according to hope of life everlasting " (Tit. III, 5-7). The same Holy Spirit liberates us from the tyranny of sin (Rom. VIII, 13), and places us in a state of adoptive filiation: " The Holy Ghost who is given to us... himself giveth testimony to our spirit, that we are the sons of God " (Rom. v, 5, VIII, 15). He is the " Spirit of life " (Rom. VIII, 2), because He brings supernatural life wherever He dwells, and His abode is the soul of the just (I Cor. III, 16, II Cor. VI, 16).

The Apostle expresses the same thought when he says that we are " in Christ Jesus. " With Christ we " suffer " (Rom. VIII, 17), are crucified (Rom. VI, 6), are " planted together into the likeness of his death " (Rom. VI, 5), are " buried together with him " (Rom. v, 4), have " risen with Christ " (Col. III, 1), live together with Him (Rom. VI, 8), are quickened together with Him (Eph. II, 5), are made conformable to Him (Phil. III, 10), shall be glorified with Him (Rom. VIII, 17), and reign with Him (II Tim. II, 12). If we are therefore so intimately associated with Christ, our Head, we also share the life which He communicates to the members of His mystic body.

The first effect of baptism then is to graft us on to Christ and make us participate of His life. In this " laver of regeneration " (Tit. III, 5-7) we die to the old man and put on the new: " Our old man is crucified with Christ, that the body of sin may be destroyed, to the end that we may serve sin no longer "

---

même de justification mais la réciproque n'est pas vraie ; de sorte qu'on peut concevoir un ordre de providence dans lequel l'homme pécheur serait simplement déclaré juste, au lieu qu'il est impossible d'imaginer un saint à qui ses péchés n'auraient pas été pardonnés. A ce point de vue, la justification précède logiquement la sanctification à laquelle elle sert de base ". The author correctly asserts however, that in the actual order the two are identical. Cf. GARVIE, *Studies of Paul and His Gospel*, pp. 174, 225, WEISS B., *Biblical Theology of the New Testament*, vol. I, pp. 297, 299, SANDAY, *Epistle to the Romans*[5], pp. 38, 152, SWETE, *The Holy Spirit in the New Testament*, p. 391 ff.

(Rom. VI, 6) ; " put off, according to former conversation, the old man, who is corrupted according to the desire of error. And be renewed in the spirit of your mind, and put on the new man " (Eph. IV, 22-24). This " new man, " the Apostle further tells us, " is created according to God in justice and holiness of truth " (Eph. IV, 24). Justice and holiness then are two equivalent notions ; in fact, the Apostle elsewhere says that " Christ Jesus of God is made unto us wisdom, and justice, and sanctification and redemption " (I Cor. I, 30). Baptism effaces all the sins of which the converts were formerly guilty, and produces at once a purification, a sanctification, and a justification of the sinner : " And such some of you were, but you are washed, but you sanctified, but you are justified in the name of Our Lord Jesus Christ, and the Spirit of our God " (I Cor. VI, 11). What the Apostle here says of every Christian he elsewhere applies to the entire Church : " Christ loved the church, and delivered himself up for it, that he might sanctify it, cleansing it by the laver of water in the word of life, that he might present it to himself a glorious church, not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing, but that it should be holy and without blemish " (Eph. V, 25-27 ; cf. Col. I, 21-23).

The believers are called " saints " by the very fact that they are Christians. Justice is no mere fiction in them but is as real and personal to them as the sin which it replaces. According to Eph. I, 4 God had chosen the Christians before the foundation of the world to be saints, and in Col. III, 12 they are called the elect of God, holy, and beloved. In Rom. I, 7 the Apostle addresses the converts as the elect saints, and in I Cor. I, 2 sends his greetings " to the church of God that is at Corinth, to them that are sanctified in Christ Jesus, called to be saints ; " in this passage the Corinthians are called the church of God because they are sanctified in Christ, and as sanctified by Christ they are those called by God into a state of holiness (cf. I Thess. IV, 7 ; II Thess. II, 13 ; II Tim. I, 9).

Not only is justification inseparable from regeneration and sanctification, but it is also identical with what the Apostle calls a " new creation, " καινὴ κτίσις : " If then any be in Christ a new creature, the old things are passed away, behold all things are made new " (II Cor. V, 17) ; " In Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything nor uncircumcision but a new creation " (Gal. VI, 15 ; cf. Eph. II, 10, IV, 22-24 ; Col.

III, 10). For the Apostle himself the world is henceforth crucified and he to the world (Gal. VI, 14). [1]

This new state into which the Christians have been transferred by the reception of the Holy Spirit must lead to progressive holiness and a thorough moral transformation, the fruit of which will be life everlasting : " As you have yielded your members to serve uncleanness and iniquity, so now yield your members to serve justice and sanctification " (Rom. VI, 19 ; cf. Gal. VI, 8) ; so that " being made free from sin and become servants to God, you have your fruit unto sanctification, and the end life everlasting " (Rom. VI, 22). The Apostle entreats the Corînthians to cleanse themselves from all defilement of the flesh and of the spirit, " perfecting sanctification in the fear of God " (II Cor. VII, 1). For this struggle against sin the Apostle arms his converts with the assurance that they had received the Spirit of God : " God hath not called us unto uncleanness, but unto sanctification. Therefore he that despiseth these things, despiseth not man but God, who also hath given his holy Spirit in us " (I Thess. IV, 7, 8 ; cf. II Thess. II, 13). From the same

1. We may here briefly summarize the theory of justification proposed by SHEARS, *The Gospel according to St. Paul*, pp. 50-102, the main points of which we have already discussed in the preceding pages. The author maintains that Saint Paul strongly emphasizes the view of sin as a power in the flesh essentially prior to transgression. Hence it follows that sin in its primary stage as ignorant error is not reckoned. Man is not responsible for it and is not held so by God. During this primitive period, to which Abraham belonged, when sin was unknown and unimputed, there was nevertheless a principle of differentiation. It was not that God imputed sin to the unbelieving sinner and refrained from imputing it to the believing one, but that He imputed a positive righteousness to the man of faith which He did not impute to the other. This positive imputation involved the divine recognition of human righteousness as a fact. Accordingly the " intrinsic " righteousness of faith has always been recognized by God. What rendered necessary the salvation wrought by Christ was the imperfection of the righteousness of faith due to the ineradicable taint of sin in the flesh, because of which man's faith is unable to grow without hindrance to full maturity. Accordingly, that salvation was wrought by Christ's taking the flesh of sin and conquering sin in it, thus working out the perfection of the righteousness of faith through that death unto sin in which the conflict culminated, and laying hold on that absolute and complete justification by faith which was beyond man's unaided reach. That justification eternally abides in the life that has passed through death and communicates itself, as the Spirit of faith triumphant, from the Head to the members. So what man's unaided faith could not do is accomplished by the grafting of that imperfect faith on the perfect " faith of the Son of God ".

The theory of Shears, in spite of some of its verbal resemblances with the Catholic doctrine, is in fact radically a denial of the latter because of the follow-

Spirit of the glorified Christ (I Cor. XV, 45-49) comes the transforming process by which Christians are made to bear the image of the Heavenly (II Cor. III, 18). Thus, while the " outward man " is corrupted and slowly falls into ruin, the " inner man " is renewed day by day unto eternal life (II Cor. IV, 16).

Art. IV. — GLORIFICATION.

Salvation is a continuance and a full realization of that union with Christ which the believer already possesses in the life of grace [1]. The Christian life is, as we have said above, supernaturally engendered in baptism : " For if you have ten thousand instructors in Christ, yet not many fathers. For in Christ Jesus, by the gospel, have I begotten you " (I Cor. IV, 15). This new life is not the spontaneous generation of a being in the state of complete development, nor is it a regime of simple conservation. After their supernatural birth the infants in Christ are " weak " (Rom. XIV, 1, XV, 1, ἀσθενούντες, ἀδύνατοι) and " carnal " : " And I, brethren, could not speak to you as spiritual (πνευματικοῖς), but as unto carnal (σαρκινοῖς), as unto little ones in Christ (νηπίοις ἐν Χριστῷ). I give you milk to drink, not meat, for you were not able as yet. But neither indeed are you now able, for you are yet carnal " (I Cor. III, 1-2). The Christian is not to remain stationary but must walk in Christ : " As therefore you have received Jesus Christ the Lord, walk ye (περιπατεῖτε) in him, rooted (ἐρριζωμένοι) and built

ing points which we have already refuted in the preceding pages : 1) the author deliberately and arbitrarily closes his eyes to the clear teaching of the Apostle concerning the natural law, and consequently of sin among the Gentiles even before Abraham or the Mosaic Law ; 2) the author maintains that the flesh is ineradicably tainted by sin; hence original sin becomes impossible, and the only conceivable redemption would be self-destruction and liberation from the flesh ; 3) the author denies the sinlessness of Christ's nature by maintaining that Christ took a flesh " diseased " with sin ; 4) the distinction between a " human righteousness of faith " and a " perfect righteousness of faith " has no basis in Saint Paul : for the Apostle faith is of supernatural origin and all righteousness a gratuitous gift of God, unattainable by our native unaided powers ; 5) the author teaches that Christ was the Subject not the Object of faith ; indirectly this principle leads to a denial of Our Lord's Divinity ; finally, the author does not consider the Apostles' doctrine in its ensemble, but selects only certain texts from which by an elaborate and forced process of exegesis he attempts to extract his own doctrine.

1. Cf. Joyce, *The Catholic Doctrine of Grace*, p. 33.

up (ἐποικοδομούμενοι) in him, and confirmed in the faith " (Col. II, 6-7). Incorporated into Christ, the Christian member must plunge his roots deep into Him. and remain firmly united to " the head, from which the whole body, by joints and bands, being supplied with nourishment and compacted, groweth unto the increase of God " (Col. II, 19). The converts must, however, be on their guard lest their supernatural growth be retarded ; the Apostle tells the Galatians that their return to the Mosaic Law constituted a retrogression : " My little children, of whom I am *in labour again*, until Christ be *formed* in you " (Gal. IV, 19). The Christian must be progressively transformed (Rom. VIII, 29, II Cor. III, 18), until he arrives at the age of the perfect man in Christ : " Whom (Christ) we preach, admonishing every man, and teaching every man in all wisdom, that we may present every man perfect in Christ Jesus (ἄνθρωπον τέλειον ἐν Χριστῷ (Col. I, 28) [1]. Though our knowledge of divine things at present is mediate and imperfect we have hope that one day we shall see God face to face in the beatific vision : " We see now through a glass in a dark manner, but then face to face. Now I know in part, but then I shall known even as I am known " (I Cor. XIII, 12).

That we shall eventually reach this perfect stature in Christ, that our present life of grace will one day be converted into a life of glory and immediate vision of God, of this God's love for us is the pledge (Rom. V, 6 ff.). At present, it is true, we are going through trials and tribulations but we glory in these and endure them gladly, for we know that they beget constancy, and that constancy in turn brings tried virtue and makes more certain our hope of eternal glory. The hope of glorification will not prove false, because it is founded on the love of God, not on the love which we ourselves have for God, which would be a fragile foundation indeed, but on the love of God for us (Rom. V, 5). For if God out of His boundless love, when we were as yet sinners and consequently His enemies, gave up His Son for us, *a fortiori*, now, when we are justified in Christ's Blood can we hope that grace will culminate in glory : " For if when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the

1. Does Saint Paul distinguish tnree stages in the Christian life ?
   a) νηπίοι, σαρκίνοι, ἀσθενούντες, ἀδύνατοι,
   b) ἄνθρωποι, πνευματικοί, δύνατοι,
   c) ἄνθρωποι, τέλειοι.

death of His Son, much more being reconciled, shall we be saved by his life " (Rom. v, 10).

A glorious immortality, according to Saint Paul, is a victory over death not only in the soul but also in the body. The disembodied state is never presented in his Epistles as other than one of incomplete being. Hence the salvation from a state of sin which has brought man under the law of death must include deliverance from this incomplete condition: " we groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption of the sons of God, the redemption of our body " (Rom. VIII, 23). Immortality for the Apostle is incorruption : " And the enemy death shall be destroyed last... for this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality. And when this mortal hath put on immortality, then shall come to pass the saying that is written : Death is swallowed up in victory. O death, where is thy victory ? O death, where is thy sting " (I Cor. XV, 26, 53-54). Hence Saint Paul is untiring in his efforts to place before the mind of his converts, some of whom were inclined to doubt or deny our future resurrection (I Cor. XV, 12 ; cf. Acts XVII, 32), this great truth in all its importance and consequences. The arguments which He adduces to prove the resurrection of the dead are the following : first, the practice of the Apostles and the conviction of the Christian faithful ; second, the fact of Christ's solidarity with the human race and His Headship of the mystic body of which the Christians are the members, and, finally, the indwelling within us of the Holy Ghost (I Cor. VI, 19), Who is the " firstfruits " (Rom. VIII, 23), the " seal " (Eph. IV, 30), and " pledge " (II Cor. V, 5) of a glorious immortality. The arguments which are based on the supernatural activity of the Holy Ghost may be reduced to the following formula : " If the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead, dwell in you ; he that raised up Jesus Christ from the dead, shall quicken also your mortal bodies, because of His Spirit that dwelleth in you " (Rom. VIII, 11).

Saint Paul alludes first of all to the testimony which he himself and his colleagues, by the trials of their daily apostolate, rendered to the universal belief of future resurrection : " Why are we in danger every hour ? ... I die daily ... if (according to man) I fought with beasts at Ephesus, what doth it profit me, if the dead rise not again ? Let us eat and drink, for tomorrow we shall die " (I Cor. XV, 30-32). By their voluntary

renunciations the Apostles die daily, and their life exposed to many privations is a continual immolation. But if the body has no part in the recompense, why should it be treated thus ? Would not rather the Epicurean maxims be more in place ? If for merely human motives, without a hope of a future life and a consequent glorious resurrection, Saint Paul was exposed to " wild beasts " at Ephesus, what profit or advantage was there in his action ? True, the survival of the soul alone might suffice, but a blessing which would have for object only a part of the human composite would be incomplete, and would not satisfy all our aspirations.

The Apostle proves the same truth by an *argumentum ad hominem* based on the conviction of the faithful : " What shall they do that are baptized for the dead, if the dead rise not again at all ? Why are they then baptized for them ? " (I Cor. xv, 29). In the supposition that there is no resurrection of the dead, why, asks Saint Paul, do some of the Corinthians receive baptism for their friends and relatives who died without it ? What this baptism ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν exactly was, we do not know. Some suggest that it refers to penitential works (Mk. x, 38 ; Lk. xii, 50) performed on behalf of those who had died without the grace of baptism. The more common interpretation is that it denotes a sort of vicarious baptism whereby a friend of the deceased had the ceremony performed upon himself, thus publicly affirming by a symbolic action that the departed one belonged to Jesus Christ and was awaiting a glorious resurrection. Such a practice, we know, was tolerated in the Church until the heretics began to attribute to it the effects of real baptism. The Apostle simply refers to the practice without approving or condemning it; he saw in it a mere profession of faith in the resurrection of the dead.

This universal conviction concerning our future resurrection is not without a firm foundation, for it is intimately connected with Christ's soteriological office as Second Adam ; " For by a man came death, and by a man the resurrection of the dead. And as in Adam all die, so also in Christ all shall be made alive " (I Cor. xv, 21-22). Jesus Christ came to repair the ruin and harm caused by the first Adam (Rom. v, 12-19). The relation between His Resurrection and that of the just is the same as the relation between Adam's death and that of his descendants. As Adam was the father of fallen humanity so Christ is the

father of regenerated humanity. If by one man human nature was despoiled of its gift of immortality, so it was fitting that by one man human nature be restored, in the resurrection of he body, to its primitive state and dignity. As all those therefore who are born of Adam are condemned to death, so all those who are reborn in Christ are regenerated unto immortal life in both soul and body. In His Resurrection as in His Death Christ is for Saint Paul the Chief of humanity, containing in Himself His whole community. The triumph of Christ over sin and death is not a purely individual triumph of which the Son of God had no need, but it is a collective victory, it is that of the whole mystic body of which Christ is the Head.

In baptism we become engrafted on Christ, become effectively members of the Church of which He is the Head, come to share in His Life, and participate in His privileges and destinies. Thereafter, in the actual redemptive plan and order of Providence, God owes it to Himself to raise up the faithful who are, as it were, an integral complement of Christ. Our incorporation into Christ is for the Apostle so intimate that the members must necessarily follow the Head: "If the dead rise not again, neither is Christ risen again" (I Cor. xv, 16). But the Apostle has adduced overwhelming evidence to show that Christ has risen (I Cor. xv, 5-8), and hence the conclusion that the just will also rise becomes inevitable. True, our adoption and salvation are now complete not in reality but only in hope; τῇ γὰρ ἐλπίδι ἐσώθημεν (Rom. viii, 24). Nevertheless, Christ is "the firstfruits of them that sleep" (I Cor. xv, 20), and there will accordingly be other fruits of the same kind. Our Lord is the model and exemplar according to which the just will rise. The earth is as it were a vast field in which our bodies like seed are planted, and since the "first-fruits" have already appeared, we have hope that the harvest also will follow.

When in baptism we were incorporated into the mystic body of Christ we received the Holy Spirit Who henceforth dwells in us as in His own temple (I Cor. vi, 19; II Cor. vi, 16). This indwelling of the Holy Ghost is an assurance of our future resurrection. For just as God raised up Christ because His human nature was united with His Divinity, so in like manner God will on account of the indwelling of His Spirit in our mortal bodies raise us up from the dead (Rom. viii, 11). This supernatural activity of the Holy Spirit in our souls with a view

to our future resurrection is presented by the Apostle under various aspects:

a) In II Cor. 1, 22 Saint Paul says in a general way that the gift of the πνεῦμα points forward to some future attainment of which it is the guarantee: "God hath sealed us and given the pledge of the Spirit in our hearts," θεὸς ὁ καὶ σφραγισάμενος ἡμᾶς καὶ δοὺς τὸν ἀρραβῶνα τοῦ πνεύματος ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν.

b) In II Cor. v, 5 the Spirit is described as the "pledge" of that purpose of God which the Apostle specifies as a "clothing upon with our habitation that is from heaven," ὁ δὲ κατεργασάμενος ἡμᾶς εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο θεὸς, ὁ δοὺς ἡμῖν τὸν ἀρραβῶνα τοῦ πνεύματος.

c) At present we enjoy only that imperfect adoption which follows upon justification. The last and final fruit of our consummate adoption will be the glorification not only of the soul but also of the body. The Apostle tells us that the Holy Spirit is the "firstfruits" of this adoption: "We who have the firstfruits (ἀπαρχήν) of the Spirit, groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption of the sons of God (υἱοθεσίαν), the redemption of our body (τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν τοῦ σώματος ἡμῶν) (Rom. VIII, 23).

d) The adoptive filiation which the Spirit's indwelling confers upon us involves our co-heirship with Christ which in ultimate analysis is equivalent to "our being glorified with Him" (Rom. VIII, 15-17). As soon as the σῶμα σαρκικόν has been exchanged for the σῶμα πνευματικόν, which is similar to the σῶμα τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ (Phil. III, 21), the Christian will come into possession of his κληρονομία.

e) Hence when Saint Paul says that the Holy Spirit is ἀρραβῶν τῆς κληρονομίας ἡμῶν (Eph. I, 14), this inheritance can be nothing else than the sonship and co-inheritance with Christ of which the Apostle speaks in Romans (VIII, 15-17, 23).

f) In baptism we were as it were branded by the Holy Spirit Who will reclaim us as His own on the last day: τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν ᾧ ἐσφραγίσθητε εἰς ἡμέραν ἀπολύτρώσεως (Eph. IV, 30). From these examples it is evident that the ultimate end of the Spirit's operation is the complete redemption of the whole human nature.

For this perfect "adoption of the sons of God, the redemption of our body" (Rom. VIII, 23), not only we, the half-emancipated children of God, groan within ourselves, but inanimate creation

also " travaileth in pain... to be delivered from the servitude of corruption into the liberty of the glory of the children of God " (Rom. VIII, 21-22). Nevertheless, we were not left without effective help in this struggle against sin and death: " The Spirit also helpeth our infirmity. For we know not what we should pray for as we ought, but the Spirit himself asketh for us with unspeakable groanings. And he that searcheth the hearts, knoweth what the Spirit desireth, because he asketh for the saints according to God " (Rom. VIII, 26-28). The very Spirit of God within us bears His part in our present difficulties. As He cries in us and we in Him " Abba, Father, " so He also shares the groans of our imperfect nature, converting them into prayers beyond words. There are times when we cannot pray in words or pray as we ought ; but our inarticulate longings for a better life are the Spirit's intercession on our behalf. These deep-seated yearnings of our being for future blessedness are audible to God who searches all hearts, and since they are the voice of His Spirit, they are according to His Will and will therefore prove efficacious.

The penalty which God decreed against sin was death. This death Christ, the Second Adam, endured for us on the Cross and triumphed over it in His Resurrection. But though death was rendered powerless by Jesus Christ, it was not completely annihilated. It still retains some of its former power and men continue to die even after the Passion. But if the body is still mortal because of sin, the " law " of death is neutralised by a superior force, by " the law of the Spirit and of life " (Rom. VIII, 2). The life of grace which will eventually culminate in glory has already begun. The mystic Christ is already partly constituted, and His incorporated members are participating in the life of His Spirit. When this mystic Christ shall finally have arrived at the full maturity of a perfect man (Eph. IV, 13), when all the elect incorporated into Him during the ages shall have gathered together from the four winds (II Thess. II, 1), when in the hour of the resurrection the last hostile power, death, shall be swallowed up in the supreme triumph of the Redeemer (I Cor. XV, 26), and " when this mortal hath put on immortality, then shall come to pass the saying that is written : Death is swallowed up in victory. O death, where is thy victory ? O death, where is thy sting (I Cor. XV, 54-55) ? "

INDEX.

I. ALPHABETICAL INDEX.

ABRAHAM. Abraham justified by faith, 97-100. — His justification a gratuitous gift, 100-103. — His spiritual paternity independent of the Law, 103-106. — Promise made to Abraham superior to the Law, 106-110.— Intellectual character of Abraham's faith, 324-225. — Firmness of his faith, 329, n. 2.

ABROGATION. Abrogation of the Mosaic Law, 293-304.

ADAM. Transgression of Adam, 28-44. — The new Adam, 213-218. — Contrast between the first and Second Adam, 218-224.

ADOPTION. Adoptive filiation, 143, 387-390.

AEON. Present and future aeon, 63-64, 305, n. 1.

ALLEGORY. Scriptural allegory concerning the abrogation of the Law, 301-302.

ALLIANCES. Obligations of the new alliance, 303-304. — Contrast of the old and new alliances, 386-387.

ANGELS. Saint Paul's conception of their role and character, 59-61.

ANTICHRIST. The Antichrist in Second Thessalonians, 64.

ATHENS. Saint Paul's discourse at Athens, 9-10.

BAPTISM. Baptism a sacrament, operating what it signifies, 218. — Baptism an ἐνδύεσθαι Χριστὸν, 345-347. — Baptism εἰς Χριστὸν, 347. — Baptism a mystic death and resurrection, 346-352. — Baptism and faith, 352-356. — Baptism for the dead, 416.

BEATIFIC VISION 414.

BELIAR. Beliar master of the heathen world, 62-63. cf. also SATAN.

BODY. Saint Paul's conception of the body (σῶμα), 17. — The body the temple of the Holy Ghost, 380-382.

CABALA. Cabalistic theory of the origin of sin, 48-49. — Cabalistic conception of the Second Adam, 220.

CATECHESIS. Apostolic cathechesis, 204-205.

CHARISMATA. The charismata a « fruit » of the Holy Spirit, 382-383.

CHRISTOLOGY. Pauline Christology, 147-224. — Pauline Christology and modern criticism, 147-171. cf. also JESUS CHRIST.

CHURCH. Incorporation into the Church, 357-358. — Analogies of the Church, 358-371. — The Church a spiritual building, 358-361. — The Church the Spouse of Christ, 361-363. — The Church the complement of Christ, 363. — The Church a mystic body, 363-371. — Notes of the Church, 371-378. — The Church apostolic, 371 ; holy, 371-372 ; one, 373-374, and universal, 374-378.

CIRCUMCISION. Jewish conception of circumcision, 83, n. 1. — The circumcision of Abraham, 102-103.

COLOSSIANS. The teaching which Saint Paul combats in the Epistle to the Colossians, 71-73.

COMMUNION. Communion of Saints, 368-370.

CONCUPISCENCE. Cf. SIN-PRINCIPLE.

CONFESSION. Modern theory of Christ's vicarious confession or penitence, 248-252.

CREATION. The « new creation » (καινὴ κτίσις), 411-412.

DEATH. The Pauline doctrine concerning death, 130-135. — Punitive aspect of death, 131. — Nature of this punitive death, 131. — Death a punishment, not of actual but of original sin, 133-135. The Pauline teaching on death and modern science, 135-137.

DEATH of CHRIST. References in the Pauline Epistles to the historical sufferings and death of Christ, 231-232. — Synonyms for the "Death of Christ": the "Cross", 232, and the "Blood" 232-233. — The Death of Christ a vindication of divine justice, 234. cf. also REDEMPTION.

DEVIL. The devil the cause and auxiliary of sin, 57-58, 62.

ELEMENTS. "Elements of the world" (τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου), 65-81. — The meaning of στοιχεῖον and κόσμος, 66-68, 75-78. — The "elements of the world" in the Epistle to the Galatians, 68-71, and in the Epistle to the Colossians, 71-75. — Modern theories concerning the "elements of the world", 78-81. — Notion of St. Thomas, 75, n. 2.

EUCHARIST. Historical references to the Eucharist in Saint Paul's Epistles, 200. — The Eucharist and the mystic body of Christ, 365.

EVOLUTION. The evolutionist theory of original sin, 45-52; and of the Redemption, 273-274.

EXPERIENCE. "Religious experience" as a basis for a doctrine of the Redemption, 280-284.

EXPIATION. "Christ's Death, a sacrifice of expiation, 258-261.

FAITH. Its important role in the Pauline Epistles, 321-322. — Etymology, and various senses of the term, πίστις, 321, n. 1. — The nature of faith, 323-336. — Protestant definitions of faith, 323-324. — The intellectual character of faith, testimony of the different Epistles, 324-328. — Faith as submission to the Divine Will, 328-329. — The element of "confidence" or "trust" in faith, 329-333. — The usage of πίστις without a complement, 331-332. — The usage of πίστις with a preposition and the accusative, 332-333. — Faith and "works of the Law", 333-334. — Justification by faith "alone", 334-335. — The formal object of faith, 336. — The material object of faith, 337. — The modern interpretation of πίστις Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, 337-342. — The supernatural origin of faith, 342-343. — Its external causes, 342-343. — Faith a fruit of the Spirit, 343. — The efficacy or causality of faith, 343-344. — Relation of faith to baptism, the common causality of the two, 345, 352-356.

FALL. Cf. ORIGINAL SIN.

FLESH. The Pauline conception of the flesh (σάρξ), 16-19, 26. — Relation of the flesh to the Sin-Principle, 22-25, 40-42. — Flesh not intrinsically evil, 23-24. — Flesh does not denote man as *creature*, 25-26.

FREE-WILL. Human liberty and responsibility in sin, 25.
FRUITS. The fruits of the Holy Ghost, 382-384.
FULNESS. The " fulness " of times, 143-144.
GALATIANS. Central idea in the Epistle to the Galatians, 86, n. 2, 183-184.
GENTILES. Their knowledge of God, 9-13,137-140. — Their sinfulness, 7-8, 43. — Their punishment, 138-139.
GLORIFICATION. 413-419.
GOD. Saint Paul's conception of God, 4, 126-127. cf. also HOLINESS.
GOSPEL. The " Gospel " of Saint Paul, pref. VII-XIII, 376-378.
GRACE. Cf. SPIRIT (Holy).
GREEK. Greek philosophy and literature and the Pauline Epistles, 150-170.
HELLENISM. Cf. Greek.
HISTORIC. The Protestant distinction between the " historic " Christ and the Christ of theology, 147-171. — Saint Paul's knowledge of the historic Christ, 197-208.
HOLINESS. The holiness of God in Saint Paul's Epistles, 125-128, 130, n. 2. The holiness or justice of God not opposed to His mercy, 234-235.
HOLY GHOST. Cf. SPIRIT (Holy).
IDOLATRY. The return of the Christian Galatians to idolatry, 80.
INCARNATION. 191-224.
INCORPORATION. Incorporation into the mystic body of Christ, 357-379.
JESUS CHRIST. The Person of Jesus Christ in modern thought, 147-171, 194-197. — The divinity of Jesus Christ, 163-165, 172-191 ; His divinity in the Epistle to the Galatians, 183-184 ; and in that to the Romans, 184. — Jesus Christ in the " form of God ", 172-173, 192-194. — His preexistence, 172-177. — Image of God, 173-174. — First-born of every creature, 174-176. — The " Rock " of Israel, 176-177. — Equal with the Father, 177-179. — And with the Holy Ghost, 179-181. — Source of all graces, 182-183. — " God blessed forever ", 184-187. — Jesus Christ as Lord, 188-190. — As Master of all, 190. — As Supreme Judge, 190.
Jesus Christ as Man, 191-224. — The fulness of the Godhead dwelling corporeally in the Incarnate Word, 191. — The Kenosis, 192-194. — Modern theories concerning the Kenosis, 194-197. — The historic Christ was true man, 197-201. — Theory of the Tübingen school, 198. — Saint Paul's knowledge of the historic Christ, 197-208. — Sinlessness of Christ's nature and personality, 144-146.
Jesus Christ Head of the new humanity, 208-224. — Jesus Christ Messias, 209-211. — Jesus Christ Mediator, 211-212. — Jesus Christ the Second Adam, 213-224. Jesus Christ become for us " malediction ", 214; " sin ", 215. — Christ's solidarity with the race, 215-224. — Jesus Christ Redeemer, 227-235, 252-263. — Jesus Christ the Reconciler, 263-266. — Jesus Christ Saviour, 267. — Jesus Christ victor over Sin, 286-289 ; over the devil, 290-291 ; over the flesh, 291 ;

over death, 291-292 ; over the Law, 293-304, and over the spirit-powers, 304-309. — Jesus Christ Head of the Church, 365-368.

Jews. The Jews equally sinners with the Gentiles, 8, 140. References to the Jews in the literature of classical antiquity, 155. — The Jews of Tarsus, 156-157. The Jews of Cilicia, 157.

Judaizers. 81-86.

Justice. Justice of God (attribute) cf. Holiness. Justice of God (δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ) by which God makes us just, 391-409. — Characteristics of the δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ : anthropological, not theological, 393-398. — Real, not forensic, 398-404. — The meaning of δικαιοῦν, 398-404. — Actual, not eschatological, 404-407. — Inherent, not imputed, 407-409.

Justification. 391, 409-413.

Kenosis. The doctrine of Saint Paul 192-194, 172-173. — Modern theories concerning the Kenosis, 194-197.

Law. cf. Mosaic Law, Natural Law.

Law of Christ. 303-304.

Liberals. Liberal Protestant theologians and the Person of Christ, 148-149.

Lord. Jesus Christ as Lord, 188-190.

Man. The " old " and the " new " man according to Saint Paul, p. 50, n. 1.

Master-Idea. The master-idea of Saint Paul's Epistles, pref. VII-XIII, 151, 165, 168.

Mediator. 211-212.

Messias. Jesus Christ as Messias, 209-211. — The Messias of the Jewish Apocalypses, 168-171.

Mind. The Pauline conception of mind (νοῦς), 21.

Modes. Modes of Christ's redeeming Death, 252-309.

Moral. Foundation of Christian moral, 303-304.

Moral-Influence. The " moral-influence " theory on the Redemption, 268-280.

Mosaic Law. Occasion of Saint Paul's discussion of the Law, the Judaizers, 81-88. — The apparently contradictory evaluation of the Law in Romans and Galatians, 86-88. — Usage of the term, νόμος, 88-95. — Usage of νόμος and ὁ νόμος, 89-90. — Variations in the formal conception, 90-91. — Νόμος denotes the whole Mosaic code, 91. — Divine origin of the Law, 91-92. — Generic use of νόμος, 92-93. — A metaphorical application, 93. — Analogical usage, 93-94. — The Law unable to justify, historical arguments from the case of Abraham (cf. Abraham), 95-110. — The Law a cause of the knowledge of sin, 110-112. — A cause of the multiplication of sin, 112-114. — A cause of wrath and of death, 115-116. — Helplessness of the Law in the presence of the flesh, 116-121, 140. — Role of the Law, 119-120. — Apparently contradictory statements in regard to the role of the Law, 118-119. — The Law a pedagogue and a jailer, 121-124. — Comparison of Mosaic and

heathen rites, 70-71. — The Law to be classed under the " elements of the world ", 75-81. — Abrogation of the Law, 293-304.

Moses. Moses as mediator in the giving of the Law, 106-108.

Mystery. The great mystery, pref. VII-XIII, 376-378.

Mystic Body. The mystic body of Christ, 363-370.

Natural Law. 9-13, 137-139.

Notes. Notes of the Church, 371-378. cf. Church.

Original Sin. 14, n. 1, 28-44. — Modern theories on original sin, 44-45. — Evolutionist theory on original sin, 45-52. — Psychological theory concerning the origin of sin, 53-57.

Paul (Saint). The Protestant distinction between Saint Paul's " religion " and " theology ", 150-152. — Saint Paul's education at Tarsus, 152-154. — Quotations from Greek poets in his Epistles, 153-154. — His retentive memory, 154, n. 1. — Saint Paul not a liberal Jew, 154-158. — His appreciation of human wisdom, 158-159. — Autobiographical reflections, 159-160. — His life " as a Pharisee ", 160-161. — Saint Paul a Jew in culture, 161-162. — His relation to Greek philosophy 152-162. — His knowledge of Stoic philosophy, 162-163. — His relation to the original Apostles, 165-168, 206-207. — Revelations which he received, 165, n. 1. — His conception of Christ not derived from the Jewish Apocalypses, 169-171. — His relations with the Jews after his conversion, 170-171. — His knowledge of the historical Christ, 197-208. — His Epistles occasional letters, 207-208.

Pedagogue. The Law our pedagogue unto Christ, 121-124.

Penal. Modern penal theories on the Redemption, 236-248.

Penitence. Modern theory of Christ's vicarious penitence or confession, 248-252.

Person. The Person of the Redeemer, 147-224.

Prayer. Prayer for the living, 368 ; for the dead, 369.

Progress. Progress in the Christian life, 412-415.

Promise. The promise made to Abraham, 103-110.

Propitiation. Christ's Death, a sacrifice of propitiation, 258-261.

Psychology. The psychology of Saint Paul, 16-22. — Pauline conceptions of σάρξ and σῶμα, 16-19 ; of πνεῦμα, ψυχή, and νοῦς, 19-22. — Psychological theory concerning the origin of sin, 53-57.

Ransom. The redeeming work of Christ a ransom, 286-309.

Rationalists. The rationalists and the Person of Christ, 149-150.

Reconciliation. 263-268.

Redeemer. Cf. Jesus Christ.

Redemption. The Person of the Redeemer, 147-224. — The redeeming work of Christ, 225-319. — The two events of special salvific importance, 225-226. — Constitutive elements of Christ's redeeming Death, 227. — The moral element, love and obedience of the Redeemer, 228-231. — The penal element, sufferings and death of the Redeemer, 231-236. — Modern penal theories — and criticism, 236-248. — Theory of vicarious penitence and confession — and criticism, 248-252. —

Different aspects or modes of Christ's redeeming Death, 252-253. — The Death of Christ a vicarious satisfaction, 253-256 ; a sacrifice, 256-263 ; a reconciliation, 263-268. — The " moral influence " theory concerning the Redemption, 268-280. — The Death of Christ a ransom or redemption from sin, 286-289 ; from the power of the devil, 290-291 ; from the flesh, 291 ; from death, 291-292. — Redemption from the Mosaic Law, 293-304. — Redemption from the spirit powers, 304-309. — The juridical and ethical conceptions of the Redemption, 318-319. — Redemption " by Sample ", 146, n. 1.

REGENERATION. 409-415.

RELIGIOUS. " Religious experience " as a basis for a doctrine of the Redemption, 280-284.

RESURRECTION. The resurrection of Christ attested in Saint Paul's Epistles, 202. — Christ's solidarity with mankind in His resurrection, 217-218. — An important salvific event, 226. — The resurrection of Christ considered apologetically, 310-313 ; Christologically, 313 ; soteriologically, 313-319, 385-386. — The resurrection of the Christian, 415-419.

RITES. Comparison of Mosaic and heathen rites, 70-71 .

ROMANS. Central idea of the Epistle to the Romans, 86, n. 2, 184.

SACRIFICE. The Death of Christ as a sacrifice, 256-261. — Protestant views on Scriptural sacrifice, 261-263.

SALVATION. 267.

SAMPLE. " Redemption by Sample ", 146, n. 1.

SANCTIFICATION. 409-413.

SATAN. Satan a cause and auxiliary of sin, 57-58, 61-65, 290.

SATISFACTION. Vicarious satisfaction, 216, 253-256.

SECOND ADAM. Solidarity of the Second Adam with the human race, 213-218. — Nature of the Second Adam, 218-221. — Work of Second Adam, 221-224.

SIN. Sin and the Redemption, 1-2. — Pauline conception of sin, 3-58. — Nature of sin, 3-7. — Different terms to denote sin, 3. — Definition of sin, 3-6. — Sin in the theory of evolution, 6-7. — Universal prevalence of sin, 7-13, 43. — Causes of sin, 14-58. — Auxiliaries of sin, 59-124. — Reign of Sin, 125-137. — The ever-expanding empire of slavery to sin, 137-141. — Redemption from sin, 286-293, 384-386.

SINLESSNESS. Sinlessness of Christ's nature and personality, 143-145.

SIN-PRINCIPLE. Concupiscence or the Sin-principle, 14-16, 26-27. — Its relation to the flesh 22-26, 40-42.

SOLIDARITY. Christ's solidarity with the race, 213-224. — Solidarity and substitution, 217.

SOUL. Pauline conception of the soul (ψυχή), 20-21.

SPIRIT. Saint Paul's conception of the spirit (πνεῦμα), 19-20.

SPIRIT (HOLY). Divinity of the Holy Spirit, 179-181. — Not identical with the Risen Christ, 315-318. — The Spirit the soul of the Church, 366. — " In Christ " and " in the Spirit ", 315-318, 378-379. — Personality of the Holy Spirit, 380, n. 1. — The body a temple of the Holy Spirit,

380-382. — Fruits of the Holy Spirit, 382-384. — The Spirit the principle of the Christian's moral life, 384-386. — The Spirit and the new alliance, 386-387. — The Spirit and adoptive filiation, 387-390. — The era of the Spirit, 380-419. — The Spirit, the principle of the Christian's resurrection, 415, 417-418.

Spirit-Powers. The Spirit-powers as auxiliaries of sin, 59-65. — Liberation from the spirit-powers, 304-310, 384-386.

Substitution. 217.

Synoptics. The synoptics and the Pauline Epistles, 164, n. 2, 203,

Trinity (Holy). 177-181.

Universality. Universality of sin: among the Gentiles, 7-13, 138-139; among the Jews, 8-9, 140.

Vision. Beatific Vision, 414.

World. Saint Paul's conception of the world (κόσμος), p. 68.

Wrath. 4, 123-130, 263-268.

II. EXEGETICAL INDEX.

NOTE The numbers in heavier type indicate pages where the text is explained more or less at length.

Rom. I, 3 : 199-200.
I, 4 : 196-197.
I, 7 : 177.
I, 16 : 332.
I, 16, 17 : 325.
I, 17 : 329, n. 2 ; **395-396.**
I, 18 : 128 ; 263.
I, 18-28 ; 25.
I, 18-32 : 4 ; 8 ; 13 ; **137-138 ;** 157-158.
I, 19 : 137.
I, 19-21 : 10-11.
I, 21, 22 : 158.
I, 32: 129.

II, 2-24 : 25.
II, 5, 6 : 128.
II, 9 : 7.
II, 12 : 8-9 ; 111.
II, 13 : 118 ; 408.

III, 9 : 7.
III, 19 : 4 ; 121.
III, 20 : 110.
III, 21-26 : **396-397.**
III, 23 : 7.
III, 24 : 289 ; 335 ; 401.
III, 25 : 232 ; **258-261 ;** 341.
III, 25-26 : 234.
III, 26 : 402.
III, 27 : 93.
III, 28 : 401.
III, 29 : 375.
III, 30 : 404 ; 406.

IV, 1-12 : **101-103.**
IV, 2 : 401.
IV, 5 : 115 ; 332 ; 403.
IV, 12 : 15.
IV, 15 : 104 ; 111 ; 112.
IV; 16-22 ; 329, n. 2.
IV, 18-21 ; **325.**
IV, 23-24 : 325.
IV, 24 : 404 ; 406.
IV, 24, 25 : 341.
IV, 25 : 233 ; **314-315 ;** 403.

V, 1 : 401.

Rom. V, 5-10 : 414-415.
V, 6-9 : 228.
V, 8, 9 : 228 ; 232 ; 256 ; 275.
V, 9 : 267.
V, 10-11 : 265.
V, 11 : 263, n. 1.
V, 12 : 117.
V, 12-19 : **30-40 ; 221-224 ;** 255 ; **416.**
V, 13 : 12 ; 112.
V, 14 : 290.
V, 15 : 197-198.
V, 18 : 77.
V, 19 : 117 ; **229 ;** 404 ; 406.
V, 20: 92; 113; 114; 119; 120.

VI, 3 : 332.
VI, 3-7 : **348-351.**
VI, 4, 5 : 347.
VI, 6 : 15 ; 291.
VI, 7 : 233 ; 401.
VI, 13: **15 ;** 24.
VI, 14 : 15.

VII, 1-3 : **295-296.**
VII, 5 : 22.
VII, 7 : **40-41 ;** 111 ; 161.
VII, 7, 8 : 112.
VII, 7-12 : 93, n. 2.
VII, 8-10 : 15.
VII : 8-11 : 113 ; 115 ; 119.
VII, 10, 14 : 86-88.
VII, 13 : **119-120.**
VII, 14 : 19 ; 23.
VII, 14, 18 : 117.
VII, 18 : 15.
VII, 23 : 15-16 ; 49 ; 94 ; 117.
VII, 25 : 16 ; 117.

VIII, 1 : 161-266.
VIII, 3 : **144-146 ;** 177 ; 198 ; 228.
VIII, 5 : 22 ; 117.
VIII, 6, 7 : 117.
VIII, 7 : 49.
VIII, 11 : 24 ; 381.
VIII, 12-17 : 389.
VIII, 13 : 385.

Rom. VIII, 14-17 : 180-181.
VIII, 15-17 : 418.
VIII, 16 : 388.
VIII, 17 : 390.
VIII, 19-22 : 307.
VIII, 21-22 : 418-419.
VIII, 23 : 313 ; 418.
VIII, 24 : 335.
VIII, 26-28 : 419.
VIII, 32 : 228 ; 275.
VIII, 33 : 403.
VIII, 38, 39 : 386.

IX, 5 : **184-186** ; 199.

X, 3 : 393-395.
X, 4 : 300.
X, 5 : 118.
X, 9 : 188 ; 267 ; 311 ; **325-326** ; 341.
X, 12, 13 : 189.
X, 13-17 : 342-343.
X, 16, 17 : 326.

XI, 32 : 7.
XI, 34 : 188-189.

XII, 1 : 24 ; 275.
XII, 5 : 365.
XII, 19 : 127.

XIII, 14 : **345-347.**

XIV, 6-11 : 189.
XIV, 7-9 : 190.
XIV, 10 : 405.
XIV, 15 : 275.
XIV, 17 : 402.
XIV, 23 : 326.

XV, 1-3 : 276.
XV, 3 : 231.
XV, 15-16 : 181.
XV, 16 : 317.
XV, 30 : 369.

XVI, 20 : 61.
XVI, 25-27 : 377.

I Cor. I, 18 : 225 ; 232.
I, 21 : 332.
I, 22-27 : 158-159.
I, 23 : 232 ; 311.
I, 23-25 : 119.

I Cor. II, 2 : 225 ; 232.
II, 4, 5 : 343.
II, 5 : 326.
II, 6, 8 : 63.
II, 7-10 : 377.
II, 14 : 100.
II, 16 : 189.

III, 7 : 100.
III, 10, 11 : 167.
III, 15 : 267.
III, 16, 17 : 381.
III, 19, 20 : 158.
III, 22 : 167.
III, 22, 23 : **178-179.**

IV, 4 : 402 ; 405.
IV, 9 : 60.

V, 3 : 18, n. 1.
V, 3, 5 : 62.
V, 7 : **258.**

VI, 11 : 381 ; 402.
VI, 13 : 24.
VI, 15 : 365 ; 382.
VI, 19 : 24 ; 381.
VI, 20 : 275 ; 287.

VII, 5 : 61.
VII, 10 : 202.
VII, 19 : 335.
VII, 23 : 287.
VII, 25 : 202.
VII, 34 : 18, n. 1.

VIII, 4-6 : 165.

IX, 14 : 203.
IX, 22 : 163.
IX, 27 : 406.

X, 4 : **176-177.**
X, 9 : 177.
X, 10 : 61.
X, 12 : 406.
X, 17 : 365.
X, 19 : 63.
X, 19-21 : 63.

XI, 3 : 61 ; **178, 179** ; 365.
XI, 10 : 60.
XI, 23 : 201-203 ; 231.
XI, 23-24 : 201.

I Cor. xi, 25 : **257-258**.

xii, 2 : 63.
xii, 3 : 188.
xii, 4-6 : 180 ; 317.
xii, 11 : 364.
xii, **13** : 347 ; 365.
xii, 26 : 368.
xii. 27 : 365.

xiii. 1 : 60.
xiii, 2 : 335.

xv, 1 : 205 ; 341.
xv, 1-34 : 217-218.
xv, 3 : 233.
xv, 3-4 : 202.
xv, 4 : 226.
xv, 5-8 : 311.
xv, 12-21 : 312.
xv, 13-22 : 226.
xv, 14 : 202 ; 326.
xv, 14, 15 : 311.
xv, 17, 18 : 311 ; 312.
xv, 20 : 312 ; 417.
xv, 21 : 197.
xv, 21-22 : 223 ; 316.
xv, 24 : 63 ; 306.
xv, 24-28 : **178 ; 179.**
xv, 26 : 312.
xv, 29 : 416.
xv, 30-32 : 415.
xv, 33 : 153.
xv, **45 : 315-358.**
xv. 45-47 : **42 ; 135-136 ; 218-221.**
xv, 46, 47 : 49-50.
xv, 54-55 : 415 ; 419.
xv, 56 : 113.

xvi, 13 : 326.

II Cor. i, 12 : 23.
i, 21-22 : 181 ; 317.
i, 22 : 418.

ii, 11 : 62.

iii, 6 : 387.
iii, 6, 7 : 118.
iii, 8-11 : 387.
iii, 13-18 : 107.
iii, 17 : 316-318.

II Cor. iv, 4 : 58 ; 63.
iv, 5 : 188.
iv 10 : 275.
iv, 10-11 : 18, n. 1.

v, 5 : 418.
v, 8 : 326-327.
v, 10 : 405 ; 408.
v, 14-15 : **216 ; 218.**
v, 15 : 275.
v, 16 : 170 ; **198-199.**
v, 17 : 411.
v, 18-20 : 266.
v, 19 : 211, 228 ; 266.
v, 21 : 24 ; **215** ; 233 ; **397.**

vi, 14, 16 : 62.

vii, 1 : 18, n. 1 ; 24.

viii, 9 : 177 ; 200 ; 229.

xi, 3 : 58.
xi, 15 : 61.
xi, 22 : 159.

xii, 7, 9 : 62.
xii, 9 : 189-190.

xiii, 13 : **179-780** ; 317.

Gal. i, 1 : 178.
i, 4 : 65 ; 233.
i, 8 : 60.
i, 11, 12 : 165 ; 170 ; 203.
i, 12 : 336.
i, 14 : 160.
i. 18 : 166.

ii, 2 : 167.
ii, 7, 8 : 166-167.
ii, 9 : 167.
ii, 11, 12 : 167, n. 2.
ii, 15-21 : **95-96.**
ii, 16 : 341.
ii, 19 : 297.
ii, 19, 20 : 354.
ii, 20 : 228 ; 261 ; 275.

iii, 1 : 232.
iii, 1-9 : **97-100.**
iii, 2, 3 : **84-86.**
iii, 2, 5 : 341.
iii, 8 : 403.

Gal. III. 10 : 104 ; 115-116 ; 160.
III, 11 : 402.
III, 12 : 118.
III, 13 : **214-215** ; 233.
III, 15-18 : 105.
III, 16 : 199 ; 210.
III, 19 : 60 ; 113 ; 114 ; 119 ; 300; 306 ; 307.
III, 19-21 : **106-110.**
III, 22 : 7 ; 120 ; 389.
III, 23 : 121.
III, 24 : **121-124** ; 300 ; 402.
III, 26, 27 : 340 ; **353-354.**
III, 27 : **345-347.**
III, 28 : 373.
III, 28, 29 : 210.

IV, 3 : **65-81.**
IV, 3, 9 : 86-88.
IV, 4 : 70 ; 198 ; 388.
IV, 4, 5 : 177 ; 143-144.
IV, 4-6 : 180.
IV, 7 : 389-390.
IV, 8 : **42-43.**
IV, 8-9 : 11.
IV, 9 : **65-81.**
IV, 14 : 60.
IV, 21-31 : **301-302.**
IV, 31 : 287.

V, 5 : 404 ; 406.
V, 6 : 335.
V, 13 : 287.
V, 16 : 385.
V, 17 : 117.
V, 19-23 : 22-23.
V, 24 : 291.

VI, 2 : 203.
VI, 6 : 205.
VI, 7, 8 : 408.
VI, 14 : 232.

Eph. I, 5-7 : 387-388.
I, 7 : 232 ; 256; 266 ; 289.
I, 9, 10 : 308-309 ; 378.
I, 14 : 418.
I, 22: 364.

II, 2-5 : 235.
II, 3 : 22 ; **43-44** ; 117.
II, 4-8 : **355.**
II, 8, 9 : 100-101 ; 343.
II, 11, 12 : 358.

Eph. II, 12-18 : 373.
II, 13 : 232 ; 256.
II, 13, 14 : **298-299.**
II, 13-18 : 359.
II, 14-16 : 161.
II, 16 : 232 ; 265.
II, 19-22 : **359-361.**
II, 20 : 168 ; 371.
II, 22 : 381.

III, 1-11 : 377-378.
III, 4-6 : 373.
III, 10 : 60.

IV, 3-6 : 374.
IV, 11-16 : **366-367.**
IV, 13 : 327-328.
IV, 16 : 364.
IV, 22-24 : 49-50.
IV, 26, 27 : 62.
IV, 30 : 418.

V, 2 : 228 ; 255 ; **257** ; **261.**
V, 18-19 : 188.
V, 22-30 : **361-362.**
V, 23 : 364.
V, 25 : 228 ; 261.
V, 26, 27 : 372.
V, 28, 29 : 18, n. 1.

VI, 10, 11 : 189.
VI, 11, 12 : 305, 385.
VI, 11, 16 : 62.
VI, 12 : 60.
VI, 14-18 : 61.
VI, 16 : 61.
VI, 17-19 : 368.

Phil. II, 5-9 : **172-173** ; 198 ; 229.
II, 6-9 : **192-197** ; 200.
II, 12 : 126.

III, 4-6 : 159.
III, 7-9 : 170.
III, 8, 9 : 328.
III, 9 : 393-395.
III, 10 : 231.
III, 20 : 267.

IV, 13 : 189.

Col. I, 13 : 209.
I, 13, 14 : 289.
I, 14 : **369-370.**

Col. I, 15 : **173-176 ; 209.**
I, 16 : 60.
I, 18 : 364.
I, 18, 19 : 365.
I, 19 : 211.
I, 19, 20 : 228 ; 232; 256-257; 308-309.
I, 20 : 265.
I, 24 : 364.

II, 5 : 18, n. 1 ; 341.
II, 6-8 : 327.
II, 8 : **65-81.**
II, 9 : **191-192 ; 213.**
II, 10 : 364.
II, 10-13 : **355.**
II, 13-14 : **297-298 ;** 358.
II, 14 : 232.
II, 15 : 308.
II, 16 : 76-77.
II, 16, 17 : 302.
II, 16, 19 : **367.**
II, 17 : 78.
II, 18 : 23.
II, 19 : 364.
II, 20 : **65-81.**
II, 21 : 74; 76.
II, 24-27 : 378.

III, 11 : 373.
III, 16 : 188.

I Thess. I, 4, 5 : 343.
I, 7 : 332.
I, 9 : 327.
I, 10 : 226.

II, 13 : 332 ; 336.
II, 16 : 128.

III, 5 : 61.
III, 7, 8 : 328.

IV, 2 : 203.
IV, 13 : 312.
IV, 14 : 203 ; 217.
IV, 16 : 60.

V, 9, 10 : 267.
V, 10 : 225.

II Thess. II, 3-12 : 64.
II, 8 : 305.
II, 13 : 327.
II, 15 : 205.

II Thess. III, 3 : 61.
III, 6 : 205.

I Tim. I, 15 : 177 ; 228.
I, 18-20 : 62.

II, 5 : 198 ; 211.
II, 5, 6 : 228-229.
II, 6 : 261 ; 288.
II, 14 : 58 ; 62.

III, 6 : 62.
III, 7 : 62.
III, 16 : 60 ; 177 ; 198.

IV, 1 ff. : 63.

V, 14 ff. : 62.
V, 21 : 60.

VI, 9 : 62.

II Tim. I, 3 : 159.
I, 18 : 369.

IV, 16, 17 : 232.
IV, 17 : 189.
IV, 18 : 405.

Tit. I, 12 : 153.

II, 13-14 : 187.
II, 14 : 229 ; 261.

III, 4-6 : 181 ; 317.
III, 5 : 335.
III, 7 : 402.

Philem. V, 5 : 341.

Heb. I, 3 : pref. VII.

VII, 19 : 118.

VIII, 8 : 294, n. 1.
VIII, 13 : 302.

IX, 8 : 294, n. 1.
IX, 15 : 295 n.
IX, 15-23 : pref. XII.
IX, 16-17 : 294, n. 1.
IX, 17 : 258.

X, 20 : 294, n. 1.

XII, 29 : 125.

XIII, 8 : pref. VII.

Opus quod inscribitur: *The Master-Idea of Saint Paul's Epistles or the Redemption*, auctore RUDOLPHO G. BANDAS, ex auctoritate Eminentissimi ac Reverendissimi Cardinalis Archiepiscopi Mechliniensis et legum academicarum praescripto recognitum, quum fidei aut bonis moribus contrarium nihil continere visum fuerit, imprimi potest.

Lovanii, 3ª Februarii, 1925.

P. LADEUZE,
Rect. Univ.

Universitas catholica Lovaniensis

Dissertationes ad gradum magistri in Facultate Theologica consequendum.

SERIES PRIOR.

1. A. Kempeneers. *De Romani Pontificis primatu ejusque attributis*, 1841.
2. H. J. Feye. *De matrimoniis mixtis*, 1847.
3. C. De Blieck. *De unitate Ecclesiae catholicae*, 1847.
4. V. A. Houwen. *De parochorum statu*, 1848.
5. N. J. Laforêt. *De methodo theologiae sive de auctoritate Ecclesiae catholicae tamquam regula fidei christianae*, 1849.
6. Ph. Van den Broeck. *De theophaniis sub Vetere Testamento*, 1851.
7. A. Heuser. *De potestate statuendi impedimenta dirimentia pro fidelium matrimoniis soli Ecclesiae propria*, 1851.
8. F. J. Jadot. *Patrum antenicaenorum de Verbi consubstantialitate doctrina*, 1857.
9. Th. J. Lamy. *De Syrorum fide et disciplina in re eucharistica; accedunt veteris ecclesiae syriacae monumenta duo; Joannis Telensis resolutiones nunc primum editae et latine redditae; Jacobi Edesseni resolutiones canonicae syriace cum versione latina*, 1859.
10. A. J. Liagre. *Interpretatio epistolae catholicae S. Jacobi*, 1860.
11. A. C. M. Van Gameren. *De oratoriis publicis et privatis*, 1861.
12. E. H. J. Reussens. *Syntagma doctrinae catholicae Adriani VI, P. M.*, 1862.
13. F. J. Moulart. *De sepultura et coemeteriis*, 1862.
14. L. Henry. *De residentia beneficiatorum*, 1863.
15. C. M. De Robiano. *De jure Ecclesiae in universitates studiorum*, 1864.
16. A. J. J. Haine. *De hyperdulia ejusque fundamento*, 1864.
17. A. B. Van der Moeren. *De processione Spiritus sancti ex Patre Filioque*, 1865.
18. F. J. Demaret. *De origine Evangeliorum deque eorum auctoritate historica*, 1865.
19. J. B. Abbeloos. *De vita et scriptis sancti Jacobi, Batnarum Sarugi in Mesopotamia episcopi*, 1867.
20. A. Van Weddingen. *De miraculo deque ejus in christiana demonstratione usu et valore*, 1869.
21. J. L. J. Liagre. *De hominis exaltatione ad ordinem supernaturalem*, 1871.
22. H. J. L. Hermes. *De capitulo sede vacante vel impedita et de vicario capitulari*, 1873.
23. B. T. Pouan. *De seminario clericorum*, 1874.
24. H. C. C. Lambrecht. *De sanctissimo Missae sacrificio*, 1875.
25. A. Muller. *De placito regio*, 1877.
26. J. Thys. *De peccato originali*, 1877.
27. M. B. G. Fink. *De concordatis*, 1879.
28. H. J. T. De Brouwer. *De fide divina*, 1880.
29. G. J. Waffelaert. *De dubio solvendo in re morali*, 1880.
30. L. J. Lesquoy. *De regimine ecclesiastico juxta Patrum apostolicorum doctrinam*, 1881.
31. J. Forget. *De vita et scriptis Aphraatis, sapientis Persae*, 1882.

32. J. E. Hizette. *Definitionis vaticanae de infallibili Romani Pontificis magisterio commentarium theologicum*, 1883.
33. P. Mannens. *Disquisitio in doctrinam S. Thomae de voluntate salvifica et praedestinatione*, 1883.
34. C. Lucas. *De naturali nostra cognitione Dei*, 1883.
35. O. F. Cambier. *De divina institutione confessionis sacramentalis*, 1884.
36. F. C. Ceulemans. *De parvulis qui sine baptismo moriuntur*, 1886.
37. G. J. Crets. *De divina Bibliorum inspiratione*, 1886.
38. A. Van Hoonacker. *De rerum creatione ex nihilo*, 1886.
39. A. Hebbelynck. *De auctoritate historica libri Danielis, necnon de interpretatione vaticinii LXX hebdomadum*, 1887.
40. J. Bauduin. *De consuetudine in jure ecclesiastico*, 1888.
41. M. Lecler. *De romano sancti Petri episcopatu*, 1888.
42. L. J. Mierts. *De resurrectione corporum*, 1890.
43. A. Auger. *De doctrina et meritis Joannis van Ruysbroeck*, 1892.
44. J. B. Chabot. *De sancti Isaaci Ninivitae vita, scriptis et doctrina*, 1892.
45. C. Scheys. *De jure Ecclesiae acquirendi et possidendi bona temporalia*, 1892.
46. A. Knoch. *De libertate in societate civili*, 1895.
47. H. Poels. *De historia sanctuarii arcae fœderis*, 1897.
48. P. Ladeuze. *Étude sur le cénobitisme pakhômien pendant le quatrième siècle et la première moitié du cinquième*, 1898.
49. A. Camerlynck. *De quarti evangelii auctore*, 1899.
50. A. Michiels. *L'origine de l'épiscopat*, 1900.
51. A. Van Hove. *Étude sur les conflits de juridiction dans le diocèse de Liége sous Érard de la Marck*, 1900.
52. G. Voisin. *L'Apollinarisme*, 1901.
53. H. Coppieters. *De historia textus Actuum Apostolorum*, 1902.
54. E. Van Roey. *De justo auctario ex contractu crediti*, 1903.
55. F. Claeys-Boúúaert. *De canonica cleri saecularis obedientia*, 1904.

SERIES SECUNDA.

1. C. Van Crombrugghe. *De soteriologiae christianae primis fontibus*, 1905.
2. Th. Van Oppenraaij. *La doctrine de la prédestination dans l'Église réformée des Pays-Bas*, 1906.
3. E. Tobac. *Le problème de la justification dans saint Paul*, 1908.
4. J. Lebon. *Le monophysisme sévérien*, 1909.
5. G. Kisselstein. *Les dons et legs aux fabriques d'églises paroissiales en Belgique*, 1912.
6. P. Ricard. *De satisfactione Christi in tractatum s. Anselmi « Cur Deus homo »*, 1914.
7. P. Van Cauwenbergh. *Étude sur les moines d'Égypte depuis le Concile de Chalcédoine* (541) *jusqu'à l'invasion arabe* (640), 1914.
8. E. Broeckx. *Le catharisme*, 1916.
9. H. Lamiroy. *De essentia ss. Missae sacrificii*, 1919.
10. A. De Meyer. *Les premières controverses Jansénistes en France* (1640-1649), 1919.
11. R. Koerperich. *Les lois sur la mainmorte dans les Pays-Bas catholiques*, 1922.
12. R. Draguet. *Julien d'Halicarnasse et sa controverse avec Sévère d'Antioche sur l'incorruptibilité du corps du Christ*, 1924.
13. R. G. Bandas. *The Master-Idea of Saint Paul's Epistles, or the Redemption*, 1925.

Printed by Desclée, De Brouwer and C°, Bruges (Belgium).

2809

220.17
B15

AUTHOR
Bandas, Rudolph

TITLE Master-Idea of St. Paul's Epistles or the Redemption

DATE LOANED	BORROWER'S NAME	DATE RETURNED
FEB 13	Francis	

GRADUATE THEOLOGICAL UNION LIBRARY
BERKELEY, CA 94709